The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

ol. CXXXIV NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1932 No. 3475

Contents

DITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 153
DITORIALS:
Dynamite at Shanghai 156
Unless We Cancel the Debts 157
A Lesson for Candidates 158
Minneapolis Morals 158
OW MANY HUNGRY? By Mauritz A. Hallgren 159
MERICA'S ROLE AT THE CONFERENCE. By David W. Wainhouse 162
AKER'S BREAD: COSTLY AND TASTELESS. By Winifred Raushenbush 164
AHATMA GANDHI MEETS ROMAIN ROLLAND 167
ONTROLLING FOREIGN LOANS. By Morris L. Ernst 168
THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 169
ORRESPONDENCE 170
INANCE: THE REAL CREDIT PROBLEM. By S. Palmer Harman 171
OOKS, ART, DRAMA:
Winter: 1932. By James Rorty 172
Jean-Jacques. By Joseph Wood Krutch 172
"Individualism" and Housing. By C. K. Bauer 173
Italian Literature. By Isidor Schneider 173
Death of an Empire. By Karl F. Geiser 174
International Drama. By Montrose J. Moses 174
Book of the Cloud. By Stanley J. Kunitz 175
Books in Brief 175
Art: William Gropper. By Louis Lozowick 176
Drama: "Worse than Death." By Joseph Wood Krutch 177
ONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE 178
NTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION:
French Logic Versus Customs Unions. By Lindsay Rogers 179

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, Editor

Associate Editors

DOROTHY VAN DOREN MAURITZ A. HALLGREN

DEVERE ALLEN

Dramatic Editor OSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Literary Editor HENRY HAZLITT

Contributing Editors

EYWOOD BROUN FREDA KIRCHWEY MARK VAN DOREN
EWIS S. GANNETT H. L. MENCKEN CARL VAN DOREN
OHN A. HOBSON NORMAN THOMAS ARTHUR WARNER

DAVID BOEHM, Advertising Manager

UBSCRIPTION RATES: Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States nd Mexico; to Canada, $6.50; and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

HE NATION, No. 20 Vesey Street, New York City, Cable Address: ATION, New York. British Agent of Subscriptions and Advertising, Miss ertrude M. Cross, 23 Brunswick Square, London W. C. 1, England.

THE FULL WICKEDNESS of the Japanese attack upon Shanghai appears from the fact that, as in the ase of our war upon Spain in 1898, hostilities began *after* he Chinese had surrendered at every point—and accepted very one of the Japanese demands. It proves that, as McKinley wanted war at any cost for political reasons, so he Japanese militarists are determined to go ahead for ulterior reasons. It is not yet plain how far the Japanese lan goes, but it is quite likely that its forces are provoking war with China to enable the Mikado to seize all of Manchuria as "reparation" after the Chinese defeat. Meanwhile he Island Kingdom is taking the chance of embroiling the whole world. Its forces, too, are proceeding in the regulation military manner of these times. After attacking without provocation, they bombed from airplanes homes, hospitals, and public buildings, killing men, women, and children. They destroyed the Commercial Press, China's foremost publishing house. These facts are vouched for by the Shanghai Y. M. C. A., the World's Chinese Students' Federation, the China Institute of Pacific Relations, the Union of Chinese Universities, and others. It was a cold-blooded massacre and one which merits reprobation by the civilized world. And latest bulletins contain the almost incredible news that Japanese warships are shelling Nanking and under cover of the shell-fire Japanese marines are being landed with a view, evidently, to occupation of the city.

BUT WHEN WE SAY THIS we wish no one to believe that we are inciting people to take up arms in order to "revenge" those acts and kill a lot of Japanese who committed these bloody wrongs under the orders of a medieval government. That will get the world nowhere. If there ever was a time to apply the lessons of the World War this is it. From that criminal folly the world has not yet recovered, if it is going to recover; indeed, this tragedy of Shanghai is doubtless a direct outcome of that struggle and of the teachings of Wilson and the Allied leaders that wrongs are to be redressed and the world purified by torturing and disemboweling men, women, and children. What the situation does call for is the bringing of world opinion to bear upon Japan in an unprecedented degree. We hope that every American organization that can possibly act will let the Japanese Ambassador know by telegraph at once that America is united in horror over this deed and demands the immediate cessation of hostilities and the withdrawal of Japanese troops. We hope that there will be mass-meetings everywhere to let their messages be known. It is the hour for the moral forces of America to be heard, and we believe they will respond. That Japan will be heavily punished we have no doubt. Its Shanghai warring may well spell economic disaster and the end of the kingdom. But, as we have said elsewhere, the only policy for us is to get our nationals out of Shanghai and then withdraw ships and soldiers as rapidly as possible.

UNDER DARK SKIES, indeed, the Disarmament Conference meets in Geneva. To the militarists reluctantly assembled there as advisers, and to the statesmen who have come only half-heartedly or with the determination to block the relief of suffering humanity, the Shanghai massacre comes, of course, as a welcome aid. But nothing that is happening in China should keep the governments of America and Europe from steadfastly pressing for disarmament. Upon the backs of the workers chiefly rests the burden of paying the $5,500,000,000 which Mr. Hoover has stated officially to be the annual burden Europe and America carry for armaments which never protect but inevitably lead to war. What ought to be pointed out in Geneva is that a disarmed Japan would never have made the onslaught upon Manchuria and Shanghai; it would have sought redress for wrongs in a humane and decent way through the League of Nations, the World Court, or a friendly and sympathetic diplomacy. But far beyond this lies the fact that at Geneva the nations of the world have the choice between bankruptcy and sanity. There is hardly a country in Europe which is not on the verge of financial collapse. Geneva offers the most direct and immediate way out; at least it could release enormous sums with which to start up trade or to take care of the destitute millions who are on the verge of desperation. Capitalism everywhere invites its own end if it does not take the Geneva opportunity to free the world in considerable degree from the domination of militarism.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WE HOPE that the horror in Shanghai will not prevent Congress from going ahead and reducing the army in line with the recommendations of the subcommittee of the House Military Affairs Committee headed by Congressman Collins of Mississippi. Congress ought to realize that the American army is the most topheavy in officers of perhaps any army in the world, now that the Spanish army has been modernized. For example, we have ninety colonels of cavalry to command six regiments of horse! It is idle to say that we need these officers for service in time of war; there will be no more cavalry regiments and the War Department has admitted this, for it is steadily motorizing the cavalry arm. We have so many generals that the War Department hardly knows where to station them. We are informed that there are three or four generals stationed in the Panama Canal Zone, and similar duplications run all through the service. More than that there is a serious block in army promotions due to the large number of men taken in at one time at the close of the war. It will be to the interest of the whole army to have this block broken. Certainly, the Citizens Military Training Camps and the Reserve Officers Training Corps ought to go; the latter is worthless from a military point of view, save for the inculcation of militarism. This is the time to cut the army down, and it must be done.

WHO ARE THE MEN selected to manage the Reconstruction Finance Corporation? Dawes, Meyer, Bestor, Mellon (or Mills), Couch, Jones, and McCarthy. Eugene Meyer, Jr., chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, is the chief financial adviser to the Hoover Administration. Paul Bestor is the Federal Farm Loan Commissioner and has been an instructor in Latin American history at Yale and the head of a firm engaged in draining and developing farm lands. Secretary Mellon and his assistant, Ogden L. Mills, have been in charge of the Treasury Department, with its immense responsibilities, both before the depression began and since. Harvey C. Couch is president of the Arkansas Power and Light Company, has several other power-trust connections, is an opponent of government development and management of Muscle Shoals, and is the man who persuaded Senator Robinson of Arkansas, Democratic floor leader, to support President Hoover a year ago in the fight against direct government relief for hungry farmers and workers. Jesse H. Jones has for many years been a lavish contributor to Democratic campaign funds, and was until recently treasurer of the Democratic National Committee. Wilson McCarthy, a former district attorney and judge in Utah, is a director in numerous corporations in the Mountain States. All of these men, with one exception, are now holding or have held political offices, and the exception is Mr. Jones, who for years was one of the owners of the Democratic Party. On the whole, the list is fairly representative of the type of business men and politicians who have been thoroughly discredited by their lack of effective leadership in the present depression. To them the Hoover Administration has intrusted the task of distributing a $2,000,000,000 dole to industry on the ground that this dole will help bring about an economic recovery.

NEWTON D. BAKER has convinced many politicians that he would make an ideal Presidential candidate. The owners and managers of the Democratic Party, who for months had been looking about them for a conservative candidate to oppose Franklin D. Roosevelt, had previously turned thumbs down on the former Secretary of War. He was making too many speeches in support of the League of Nations, and in these speeches he was saying all too plainly that the United States ought to join the League. Whether or not they objected to his idealism, the politicians did not like his positive views on this subject. They do not like to take chances with a candidate who is likely to offend any small part of the electorate. But Mr. Baker has seen the light. He has accommodated the Democratic conservatives—and presumably himself, though he still denies that he is a candidate—by publicly tempering his idealism. He has declared that while he still has faith in the League, he believes that the American public is not yet ready for membership, and therefore the League should not be made an issue in the approaching campaign. Of such stuff are Presidential candidates made.

ACCORDING TO THE KELLOGG PACT, the United States Government has renounced, that is to say, outlawed, war as an instrument of national policy and as a means of settling international disputes. But according to the Supreme Court, if an alien holds war to be unlawful, he may not become a citizen of the United States. To adjust this paradox Representative Griffin of New York in 1929 introduced a bill in Congress amending the naturalization laws to provide "that no person mentally, morally, and otherwise qualified shall be debarred from citizenship by reason of his or her religious views or philosophical opinions with respect to the lawfulness of war as a means of settling international disputes." The merit of this bill is self-evident. Nevertheless, it has for more than two years been blocked by the jingoists and other extreme patriots—among them Major General Amos A. Fries, Fred R. Marvin, and Miss Mary Kilbreth. They have been ably supported by Chairman Johnson of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. These superpatriots have been permitted to use the committee as a means of spreading their propaganda against pacifism. For example, the record of the committee's hearings on the bill contains twenty pages of articles and excerpts from Miss Kilbreth's magazine, the *Woman Patriot*. These efforts to block this very necessary legislation should be met by the united support of all proponents of peace.

THE VOLUNTARY ACCEPTANCE by the railway labor unions of a 10 per cent reduction in pay for a period of one year is one of the most cheering developments since the depression began, and ought, logically, to have a greater influence in restoring confidence than the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. For the action of the railway unions is important both directly and symbolically. Directly, it is estimated that it will save the railroads $210,000,000. This, added to the $100,000,000 or more expected from the recent freight-rate increase, will make a difference in revenues of at least $300,000,000 a year—more than half of the entire net operating income earned by the railroads in 1931. The first effect of this will be to give added security to the insurance companies and savings banks that hold so large an amount of railroad securities, and to remove the specter of bankruptcy from some of the railroads—more than seventy

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of them—that failed to earn their fixed charges in 1931. The next effect should be to increase the purchasing by the roads of manufactured goods and fuel; the roads make normally about $1,700,000,000 of such purchases; in 1931 these amounted to only $863,000,000. Another result, let us hope, will be an early increase in railway employment. Both the spokesmen for the unions and the spokesmen for the railways—particularly Daniel Willard—deserve congratulations for the decision. It would be extremely unfortunate, however, if employers were now to regard the admirably conciliatory action of the railway unions as the signal for a further general "deflation of labor." Labor cannot be asked to take any greater reduction in wages than the decline in the cost of living; its proportional share in the national purchasing power must in no event be diminished.

ECONOMIC NATIONALISM continues to reach ever dizzier and more perilous heights. In the British Isles it has become an unpatriotic act not to "buy British." It does not matter whether the goods to be bought are inferior, or are higher priced, and it does not seem to have occurred to anyone that this campaign is proving a serious blow to international trade, which is the very basis of economic prosperity in England. The important thing is that the goods must have originated in the British Isles or one of the dominions. France is moving toward the same goal by simply shutting off foreign products which the French manufacturers do not want the people to buy. Far from acting as a deterrent, this mad course has only inspired us to go and do likewise. Already there is talk of a "buy-American" campaign. President Hoover has suggested that Congress enact the necessary legislation to give American producers the preference in the purchase of supplies and materials by government departments. From governmental purchases the thing can readily spread to public buying, and to widespread demands that the tariff be raised so high as effectively to bar all foreign goods that compete with our own in the American market. We could hardly choose a more certain way of committing economic suicide.

FOR ALL PRACTICAL PURPOSES the navy seems to be pretty well in control of Hawaii. The grand jury which was to consider bringing in indictments against Mrs. Fortescue, Lieutenant Massie, and two enlisted men finally was able to find an indictment of second-degree murder. The four defendants are at liberty and "enjoying themselves," according to reports, at Pearl Harbor Naval Station, having been released on bail, Mrs. Fortescue to the amount of $5,000, and the others at $2,500 each. Governor Judd has sent to the House a bill amending the rules of evidence which require corroboration of the victim's identification in cases of rape. It is even being urged that Lieutenant Massie and his associates be tried by the navy, which, all things considered, might be the simplest and neatest way out of the difficulties. A Hawaiian jury would not then be obliged to feel the pressure which its protecting Power, the United States, might feel obliged to exert for an acquittal in the murder trial. And by the time the new trial of Mrs. Massie's alleged attackers comes around, the Hawaiian law will doubtless be satisfactorily amended so that she may name the four in question, the Governor of the Territory, or Admiral Pratt himself—the fact of the rape having been completely established by hospital records—as her assailants, without fear of contradiction or another hung jury. We have not the slightest desire to see a criminal go free. But neither do we wish to see condonation of lynch law or military control of a peaceful and on the whole entirely inoffensive people.

URBANA, Illinois, took matters into its own hands the other day and saved the town. The First National and the Commercial Bank of Champaign, Urbana's nearest neighbor, failed; rumors of a run on Urbana banks were spreading panic through the town. The Mayor took charge, called the merchants and bankers of the town into conference at 7 a. m. on Tuesday, January 12, and asked that all business except food and drug stores be closed for five days beginning at once. There was evidently not a dissenting voice at the proposal for an interregnum. The five days were used by the daily newspapers in spreading confidence among the citizens, and by the banks in urging depositors to show their faith in the town not only by refusing to make withdrawals but by increasing their deposits. When the banks reopened, deposits outnumbered withdrawals twenty-five and thirty to one, and a grand feast of mutual congratulation was indulged in by bankers, business men, and town officials. It is not known what Mr. John Smith of Urbana thought about all this business; probably, since his money appears to be for the moment safe, he is congratulating, too. Nor is there complete cause for assurance that for Urbana the economic depression is over and the good old days are here again. Nevertheless, this display of public trust and of plain common sense is somehow an encouraging spot in a generally dark scene. In so far as psychology has anything to do with economic difficulties—and it may have a good deal—some such tactics as those of Urbana might be profitable for far larger communities.

FIFTY-THREE THOUSAND DOLLARS was the price paid in the sale of the Marquess of Lothian's library for the "Olive Branch Petition," a document presented to His Majesty King George III in 1775, and signed by forty-six members of the Colonial Congress, among them John Hancock, Franklin, John and Samuel Adams, John Jay, and Thomas Jefferson. It was addressed: "Most Gracious Sovereign"; it began: "We, Your Majesty's faithful subjects of the colonies"; it pleaded for peace, for cessation of the "effusion of blood" already shed at Lexington and Concord; it declared that the signers ardently desired restoration of harmony and good-will between England and her American children. In short, it asked for dominion government and declared, almost in the words of General Washington a year earlier, that "no thinking man in all North America desired independence." The document reached England in August, but since the Colonial Secretary, Lord Dartmouth, was in the country at the time, it was not presented to him in person until September 1. Lord Dartmouth consented to receive the petition but announced that "as His Majesty did not receive it upon the throne, no answer would be given." No answer was given—by King George. But in less than a year an answer was made: it was the Declaration of American Independence, and twenty-five of the signers of the "Olive Branch" put their names to it. It is hardly necessary to point a moral. But in India, in the Philippines, in many other quarters of the world, the alternative answer is reluctantly although irresistibly being prepared.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dynamite at Shanghai

JAPANESE arrogance, encouraged by the treachery of Washington and Geneva to the Kellogg Pact and the Nine-Power Treaty, has resulted in an explosion at Shanghai. It is now probably too late for diplomatic action. We shall, whether we wish it or not, have to let events take their course—wherever that course may lead us. An attempt at this hour to invoke the Kellogg Pact or any other peace agreement, or to enforce an economic blockade, or to withdraw diplomatic recognition from Japan could hardly have any effect but to inflame still further the Japanese military and their government at Tokio, who already have shown that they mean to do as they please in China, though in doing so they violate every treaty in existence and set the entire world at defiance. In any case, the authorities in Washington have now taken the position that there is nothing left in the Far Eastern situation that is worth saving—except American rights. They have sent a note to Tokio, not to remind the Japanese of their obligations under the various peace agreements, nor yet to confront them with the enormity of their crime at Shanghai, but merely to insist that whatever happens in China the rights of the United States Government and of American citizens must be observed. And to support the note they have rushed additional warships to Shanghai! Defense of our national rights, though it means war, rather than defense of the peace of the world, has become our greatest concern.

Japan might have gone ahead with its program of conquest no matter what the Western world thought of its action. All the peaceful pressure Geneva and Washington could have brought to bear on the Japanese might not have served to restrain them. But the undeniable fact remains that neither the League of Nations nor the United States has to date taken a single sincere step toward saving the Kellogg Pact and the Nine-Power Treaty from destruction at the hands of the Japanese. They have lodged with Tokio not one clear, direct, and forceful protest. To this extent the Western Powers must be held morally responsible for the Japanese invasion of the Yangtze valley. It cannot honestly be argued that Mr. Stimson's note of January 7 constituted an invocation of the Kellogg Pact or any other international agreement. It was simply a warning to China and Japan to observe American rights. Nor do we find in the incomplete correspondence recently made public by the Senate any suggestion that the State Department intended to take any vigorous or straightforward action to support the peace agreements. There was in these notes an occasional expression of concern, but nothing else. The League of Nations at the start was somewhat more explicit and determined. It charged Japan with being the aggressor in Manchuria, and it set a time limit for the withdrawal of Japanese troops. But it lacked the courage to carry its decisions through to successful conclusion.

A united front by the Western Powers at the beginning of the Manchurian trouble, that is, immediately after the capture of Mukden on September 18, would very likely have told another story. Then was the time to exert economic pressure, or to withdraw diplomatic recognition from Tokio. Then was the time, while the Japanese were still uncertain as to what effect the Mukden incident would have upon world opinion, for Geneva and Washington to have made it unmistakably clear that the world would not put up with Japanese aggression and arrogance. And the Western Powers were in an excellent position to do this. Baron Shidehara, at that time Foreign Minister of Japan, was fighting to keep the militarists in check. He had for several years been able to prevent military aggression in China. When the British and Americans shelled Nanking in March, 1927, it was largely through the influence of Shidehara and his group that the Japanese warships lying in Nanking harbor were restrained from taking part in the bombardment. There can be little doubt that if the Western Powers had openly thrown their support to Shidehara in the Mukden crisis, he would, with the help of Japanese public opinion, which is always sensitive to world opinion, have mastered the militarists. But this support was not forthcoming. Shidehara fought virtually alone. Japanese public opinion, poisoned by a carefully prepared campaign of militaristic propaganda, turned against him. Thanks to the bungling stupidity of Geneva and Washington, to put the matter in its mildest form, Shidehara was overwhelmed, and the militarists gained control. They now dominate the Japanese scene and Japanese foreign policy. Having called more than one bluff of the League of Nations since September 18, and having been given sufficient cause to believe that Washington will not act, it is inconceivable that the militarists will take seriously any further peace overtures or any sort of diplomatic pressure from the Western Powers. Washington and Geneva muffed their chance. By their action, or rather inaction, the peace machinery so painstakingly erected in the last thirteen years has been discredited, and the League of Nations in particular has been dealt a serious, if not fatal, blow. But the most immediately painful consequence of this policy is the invasion at Shanghai. Whither that tragic event will lead the world, no man can tell.

We can now only hope and pray that Washington will move with great tact in handling the Shanghai situation. Its action in sending more warships to China is a dark and dangerous omen. So delicate is the problem that the slightest misstep might readily plunge us into war. We should withdraw completely from the troubled area, taking out all our citizens, troops, and warships. The property that the government and our citizens have there, though it were worth a million times its present value, it not worth the shedding of a single drop of blood. Our commercial treaty rights can be left to another day for consideration. We have already made it plain that we intend to safeguard those rights. It is too late to save the peace treaties, too late to prevent further Japanese aggression by peaceful persuasion, but not yet too late to save ourselves from being drawn into a Far Eastern war. In their present mood the Japanese militarists cannot be trusted. We must not by our presence in China tempt them to turn upon us. We have only one course—to withdraw now, and leave "American rights" to some future conference.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Unless We Cancel the Debts

IT has now become apparent that the probabilities are immensely against any enlightened action on war debts or reparations either from France or from America. The crushing burden on Germany, of course, cannot and will not be paid. Every unbiased observer and every recent expert committee reports this either guardedly or bluntly, and the present German crisis makes it entirely obvious. French statesmen continue to act as if they had never read the reports or heard of the crisis. As for Congress, it has gone out of its way to say quite plainly that it is opposed not only to any cancelation of the war debts, but to any reduction of them, or even any further moratorium. It has flatly refused to revive the War Debt Commission, for fear such a commission would discover that the debts had to be scaled down. In brief, it has refused to do what any intelligent banker, no matter how lacking in altruism, does—it has refused to investigate its debtors' capacity to pay. It has preferred a wilful blindness. Mr. Hoover, in his turn, has rid himself of the problem by retreating behind the absurd fiction that reparations are purely the concern of Europe.

Under such circumstances, it seems futile to continue to point out how insane our policy is. It is more profitable, perhaps, to ask ourselves what is now most likely to happen. The present moratorium on German reparations expires on July 15. The next debt payments from the Allies to ourselves are not due until December 15. It is possible, therefore, that under the pressure of events France will consent to extend the German moratorium for five months. Germany will continue to insist on a final settlement by July, but no matter what further collapse occurs in Germany, this request will probably be ignored. Farther than this slight extension of the moratorium France is extremely unlikely to go. How can the French Government be expected to consent to any reduction of the reparations worth talking about when it has had the most emphatic notice from Congress that under no circumstances will we in turn consent to deduct a penny from the war debt? What, then, will France do before the extended moratorium period expires? Doubtless it will join with England and the other Allies in requesting a further extension of the moratorium from us. If this request is made before election day, Mr. Hoover will of course refuse even to submit it to Congress. If it is made after election day, Mr. Hoover will probably submit it, but Congress will in any case reject it. The Allies will then notify us that they are taking advantage of the clause in their war-debt contracts permitting them to suspend payments for two years.

The next move will probably be Germany's. Whatever German Government is in power will demand complete cancelation of all reparations. It is possible that France will then extend the moratorium on the unconditional payments, but it is much more likely that it will refuse even that. Germany will then repudiate the reparations. This will leave several courses open to France. It may proceed to apply "sanctions" and move troops into Germany; but it may hesitate to do this through inability to see just what the troops would do when they got there. If the French seized mines, they would have to operate the mines; if they seized railroads and factories, they would have to operate them also. And this could not be done in a partial way; it would have to be done completely. The French could not operate an automobile factory, for example, unless they operated the railroad bringing raw materials to the factory and shipping out the finished product, as well as the contributing steel works, glass works, leather companies, tire companies, and so on—at least to the extent that such semi-finished materials could not be profitably imported from France or elsewhere. But obviously not a fraction of the excess skilled French labor could be found to carry on such work. It has been suggested that French industrialists might take control of German industry. But even if we assume that they could secure ownership, either of bonds or stocks, the problem of reparations would hardly be changed. True, it would cease to be a problem of taxation, but it would continue to be a problem of transfer; and if the payments existed on any scale comparable with those under the present reparations, the system would be just as certain to break down.

It is possible that much of this may become apparent to French statesmanship before any action against Germany is taken; but whether it does or not, it will become apparent very shortly after action is taken. France's next step, therefore, will be to combine with the other Allies to request an international conference for the drastic scaling down both of debts and reparations. This Congress will reject. France, England, Italy, and the rest will then notify us that they are unable to make further debt payments. Senators Borah and Johnson will make scorching statements condemning Europe for its repudiation of a sacred contract, and the American press will swell the denunciatory chorus. European statesmen and press will reply to Uncle Shylock in kind. Stocks and bonds will probably undergo another collapse; the economic crisis will become worse everywhere. Mutual bitterness and recrimination will continue for years; America and the Allies will throw up still further discriminatory tariffs against one another, and help still further to ruin one another's foreign trade. Statesmen on both sides of the water will continue to feel righteous indignation and thorough self-satisfaction.

Such is the future we have to look forward to if we base our view on a cold weighing of the probabilities. Events may not occur in the order named; but the final result can hardly fail to be the same. There is, of course, one chance in ten that a miracle will happen, and that Congress and the Administration will forgive the debts purely out of intelligent selfishness. In that case, of course, we shall not get our money either, but we shall at least have the world's good-will, and in such an atmosphere confidence and trade would rise like a submerged raft from which a great rock has been rolled off. There is a huge psychological difference, which we have not yet remotely begun to appreciate, between what follows when a creditor forgives a debt and what follows when a debtor repudiates it. It remains to be seen whether that difference can be understood before it is altogether too late.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Lesson for Candidates

A CONVENTION of Ohio ministers met in Cleveland late in January and delivered themselves of some conclusions that were admirably plain-spoken. At a time when pussy-footing is practiced by nine public men out of ten, when ninety-nine out of a hundred words uttered for public consumption are mealy-mouthed, cautious, weasel, and with an eye to the main chance, plain speaking is as refreshing as spring showers on packed winter earth. The 400 ministers who met in Cleveland discussed war. They said:

> We are convinced that war is un-Christian, futile, and suicidal, and we renounce completely the whole war system. We will never again sanction or participate in any war. We will not use our pulpits or classrooms as recruiting stations. We set ourselves to educate and lead youth in the principles and practice of good-will, justice, understanding, brotherhood, and peace. We will not give our financial or moral support to any war.

The ministers did not stop here. They added:

> Governments which ignore the Christian conscience of men in time of peace cannot justly claim the lives of men in time of war. We deplore making military service against conscience a test of citizenship, as in the Macintosh case, and military training a requirement in education, as in our land-grant colleges. . . . Therefore be it resolved that we . . . solemnly refuse to acknowledge the obligation which the Supreme Court declares to be binding upon its citizens. . . . We will use whatever influence is within our power, in our personal relations or in public address, to inform others and to awaken them to the peril in which this decision involves their traditional and most fundamental liberty.

The ministers also had a few words to say about unemployment. Asking themselves whether "men have a right to expect a job and whether society has an obligation to provide it," they answered:

> The present industrial and economic order which assumes the right to accumulate profits large or small in unequal and inordinate distribution must take also the responsibility for work and working conditions for those who are the producers of such favorable balances.

Going on to a further consideration of our economic structure, the resolutions indorsed the principle of unemployment insurance and of "greater federal supervision of the industrial program of competition," declared protective tariffs a "constant source of friction," and recommended that the United States "take the initiative in repudiating the traditional method of intervention by armed force to protect the lives and business interests of its citizens in other lands."

It is true that only 400 men indorsed these sentiments; it is true also that many of the resolutions were bitterly fought and were only carried by the force and persuasiveness of the younger group in the convention. But they were all carried. One wonders what would happen if any one of the estimable gentlemen who are at present angling for the Presidential nomination with a leg on either side of every political fence should be as forthright. Obviously these aspirants to high office believe that to do so would lose them votes. There is a possibility that just the opposite is the case.

Minneapolis Morals

WE have had occasion before to comment upon choice bits culled from the showman's Bible *Variety*. Into the somewhat sheltered life of a *Nation* editor this admirable weekly brings news of a world which Mr. Mencken would appropriately describe as "gaudy," and we recommend it heartily to those who are interested in manners and morals but who find themselves cursed with any sort of tender-mindedness. Little incidents in which others would find, at the very least, an editorial "cause for alarm" are merely facts to *Variety*, and there was probably never before any journal which so completely accepted—without ever having heard of it—the doctrine that morals are merely *mores*. In the show business it is frankly only a question of what one can get away with in New York, or Chicago, or Duluth.

Consider, for example, the front page of a recent issue. Who would not be intrigued by the dispatch from Los Angeles describing the success of various "Park 'n' Drink Night Spots" which employ houris to supply highball "set-ups" to "the tired business man too tired to climb out of his car"? And who could fail to be further impressed by the managerial astuteness which provides that the hostesses (limited one to a car) are *supposed* to go no farther than the running-board, or by the further comment that the "amount of whoopee permitted is also strictly controlled, as the outdoor spots are too close to busy corners to tip the lid all the way." Then there is a dispatch headed "Baptists and Wrestlers Conflict in Atlanta," which promises to be interesting and is, but we are most impressed with the news from Minneapolis. It is headed "Minne. Burlesque Chorus Boys Flop; Cops Pass Strip Dancing in the Dark," and we shall quote it in full with the remark that those to whom the language is strange will find the effort to master it worth while:

> The Gaiety (burlesque) has dismissed its male choristers and substituted dancing in the dark à la strip by the girls. The cops have okayed the scanty shaking as long as the bulbs don't glow while the gals quiver. The first and only male chorus line ever known in burlesque didn't last long.
>
> As runway attractions the masculine group failed to lure sufficient feminine trade to warrant retention despite the free exposure of manly figures up and down the orchestra gangplank.
>
> A nudist's conception of the art of Terpsichore, as specially interpreted by Hinda Wausau, has the approval of the police, providing the management pulls down the dimmers and thereby aggravates the customers. The head electrician stands a chance of becoming one of the most popular guys in town with a swell opportunity for side coin to miss a cue or two.

We have nothing but pity for that part of mankind which will pay money for the privilege of imagining what it could see if it could see anything at all, but we wonder if the cops are wise. From what we have heard tell, burlesque queens become less seductive in exact proportion to the clarity with which they stand revealed, and if we were managing the morality of Minneapolis we should provide that such performers could appear undraped only under a double spotlight.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How Many Hungry?*

By MAURITZ A. HALLGREN

HOW many people are hungry in the United States today? How many are in desperate need and are getting no relief, or at best only the barest minimum of help, all too inadequate, from public and private charities? How much money is needed to give these people, not the comforts to which they may have been accustomed under their former standard of living, but just enough bread, clothing, shelter, and medical attention to keep them from suffering and from possible death by starvation, to prevent disease and permanent physical disablement for their children, and to stop from spreading through the country that demoralizing feeling of insecurity which has already reduced hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of Americans to dangerous despair?

Lastly, where is this money to come from? Nobody seems to know. No one seems to have the slightest idea as to the number of persons actually in need, the amount of money necessary to help them, or the sources from which these funds can best be obtained.

A subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Manufactures has been seeking the answers to these pressing questions. It has heard the testimony of dozens of persons, most of them experienced social workers who have been in close and constant touch with the vast financial and human problems directly involved. It has listened to public officials and trade-union leaders, industrialists and journalists qualified to interpret public opinion, and it even went to the unprecedented length of hearing a representative of the unemployed, though this man came uninvited and was shown scant courtesy when he demanded to be heard. But these experts were unable to give an all-inclusive picture of the problem facing the country. Estimates of the number of unemployed were given guardedly and ranged from six million to twelve million for the nation as a whole. In Chicago, said Samuel A. Goldsmith, director of the Jewish charities of that city, "40 per cent of all people who may work, are able to work, and are willing to work have no work!" In New York City the number of unemployed was placed at more than a million; in Pennsylvania at approximately 900,000. But the national figures were only guessed at, and nowhere was there any agreement as to how many needy persons these statistics represented. Some of the social workers said that on the average there were three persons in need for every one unemployed, but the public officials and industrialists challenged this proportion as "too extravagant."

Again, though the witnesses could give in detail the extent and character of their own local problems, they had little or no knowledge of conditions beyond their communities. A few experts, such as Ralph G. Hurlin, statistician of the Russell Sage Foundation, were able to present surveys of the amount of relief extended in various of the larger cities, but their testimony failed to cover many other cities, and omitted whole sections of the country. Nor were these experts able to state with any precision what the needs of the immediate future might be. Some hope, based on many uncertain and variable factors, was held out that the larger municipalities would be able to care for their own unfortunates, but this hope did not extend to the smaller communities and the farming areas. Mr. Hurlin declared that "organized relief is limited pretty much to the cities." He was "decidedly" of the opinion that a vast majority of the smaller communities and the rural districts were doing "relatively little in efficient administration of relief." Benson Y. Landis, executive secretary of the American Country Life Association, emphasized the growing need for relief in the farming areas. Within the last few years, he said, "many of the farms have become a refuge for persons unemployed." The depression is forcing people to desert the cities and return to their relatives and former homes, not to take up farming anew, but in the hope of obtaining shelter and something to eat. The counties cannot carry all these people. They derive revenue primarily from real-estate taxes, and, according to Mr. Landis, "we have certainly about reached the limit in taxing farm property."

Private contributions to unemployment-relief work have fallen far behind the rapidly growing demand for relief. Herbert Benjamin, representative of the Unemployed Councils of the United States, stated his belief that the unemployed will never get the help they need until every man in Congress "is shivering in his very pants because he thinks the unemployed are going to engage in struggle if they do not get something." That fear of disturbances has proved a stimulus to private contributions was shown by Mr. Goldsmith. He declared that "one little rent riot on the South Side in the Negro district" turned out to be of great help in the Chicago drive for funds. But apparently there have not been enough rent riots. Jacob Billikopf, director of the Federation of Jewish Charities in Philadelphia, submitted a letter stating that data from 130 cities revealed an increase in private contributions of only 14.3 per cent in 1931 as compared with 1930. "Yet relief demands in every American city," the letter continued, "show an increase quite out of proportion to this gain. Philadelphia's relief expenditures during September of this year were 404 per cent above September, 1930; Chicago's 267 per cent; New York's 125 per cent; Cleveland's 134 per cent; St. Louis's 214 per cent." Allen T. Burns, executive director of the Association of Community Chests and Councils, said that there had been an increase of 59 per cent in relief allotments by private charities affiliated with his organization, but declared that this "should be compared with the fact that relief expenditures in these communities are now averaging more than 200 per cent of those of a year ago." And, he warned, "there is no sign of abatement in these increased demands, and so no prospect of sufficient private funds to meet them."

Still another problem that has received almost no consideration is that of the migrant families and individuals, who, because they have no definite residence, receive no relief from local governments or charity organizations. Every community has made it a strict rule to provide for its own people

* The first of a series of articles by Mr. Hallgren on unemployment in the United States. Others will appear in subsequent issues.—EDITOR THE NATION.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

first, and there is hardly a community to be found anywhere that can, with the funds available, meet this primary requirement in anything like adequate fashion. The importance of this much-neglected problem was stressed by J. Prentice Murphy, director of the Children's Bureau of Philadelphia, who asserted that "the actual number of unsettled migrants in terms of families and individuals may run up as high as 2,000,000."

What of the communities where relief is organized and presumably efficient? "The total amount of money which is in sight at the present time," said William Hodson, executive director of the Welfare Council of New York City, "is not sufficient to care for the families and individuals who are going to be in need of help and assistance this winter." More than 250,000 families in New York City are in need, he declared, but of this number only 100,000 families are receiving assistance. In Chicago, where 40 per cent of the eligible workers are unemployed, only $100,000 a day is available to take care of families who are losing $2,000,000 daily in wages. Even these people must reduce themselves to the status of paupers before they can get help. "We insist that the people who come to our private and our public agencies," said Mr. Goldsmith, "shall use up, absolutely use up and come to us empty-handed, all their available resources. We ask them to borrow on their insurance policies and to reduce their equities in their policies. I think if this committee can get the information from the various large insurance companies as to the amounts of money that have been loaned on policies in the last two years, policies of $5,000 or under particularly, I think you will be amazed at the huge sums that people have actually borrowed on their estates. We would ask people—and it is not possible any longer to do so in Chicago and Cook County—if it were possible we would ask people to take out second and third mortgages on their homes. Indeed, one of our most serious problems in Cook County is to help the home owner, because Cook County's Department of Public Welfare does not, under the law, help home owners—and these people cannot eat their homes; they must have food, which the department is not furnishing."

Miss Dorothy Kahn, of Philadelphia, told of the struggle to provide relief in that city. Lack of funds to pay rent owed by the families of the unemployed is one of the main difficulties, she said, and as a result there have been many evictions and considerable overcrowding. "The evictions in Philadelphia," according to Miss Kahn, "are frequently accompanied not only by the ghastly placing of a family's furniture on the street, but the actual sale of the family's household goods by the constable." "We have no measure in Philadelphia today," she said, "of the overcrowding that is a direct or indirect result of our inability to pay rent for families. Only the other day a case came to my attention in which a family of ten had just moved in with a family of five in a three-room apartment. However shocking that may be to members of this committee, it is almost an everyday occurrence in our midst. Neighbors do take people in. They sleep on chairs, they sleep on the floor. There are conditions in Philadelphia that beggar description. There is scarcely a day that calls do not come to all of our offices to find somehow a bed or a chair. The demand for boxes on which people can sit or stretch themselves is hardly to be believed."

Mr. Billikopf showed what is happening to these unemployed persons from another angle. Twenty-four hundred families applied for small loans from a fund that had been made available by a few wealthy Philadelphia residents, which was intended to take care of "such of the unemployed as were too proud to apply to the charities for help." The families, said Mr. Billikopf, "filled out simple questionnaires, giving place of residence, type of employment in which they were engaged, and indebtedness. And here is a very significant fact. The schedules of the 2,400 families showed that they had exhausted all of their savings either with banks or with building-and-loan associations. These amounted to $700,000. But this is only part of the picture. These 2,400 families were in debt to their landlords, butchers, grocers, milkmen, and so on to the extent of $1,300,000. . . . Only 513 secured loans. In the case of the others it was felt that it would be an unfortunate imposition to burden them with loans when they were already so heavily in debt, without the least possibility of ever meeting their obligations."

Similarly discouraging reports were made by witnesses from other large communities. But it is in these communities that relief is best organized. One wonders what is happening in the smaller cities and towns, such as Moline, Illinois, where, according to a report from the Illinois Department of Labor which was read into the record, employment decreased 74.4 per cent in the period from September 15, 1929, to November 15, 1931, and pay rolls in the same period dropped 84.5 per cent! One might also be curious to know what is taking place in some of the smaller towns in Pennsylvania. Governor Gifford Pinchot has received many letters from constituents begging for help. A number of these he introduced into the Senate committee's record; two of them follow:

> DEAR GOVERNOR PINCHOT: I am in trouble and I cannot think any more. I am writing you that you may advise me what to do. I have ten children and lived in . . . three years ago. My husband got out of work and could not get any. He tried everywhere. My husband and I have our children and don't want to part with them. Some people tell us to drown some of them in the lake. Is there any way the government could get a small farm and pay as rent as I would like to have some place to live in peace?

> DEAR GOVERNOR PINCHOT: I am sending this letter to you and your wife to ask you won't you please and help me. I have six little children to take care of. I have been out of work for over a year and a half. Am back almost thirteen months and the landlord says if I don't pay up before the 1 of 1932 out I must go, and where am I to go in the cold winter with my children? If you can help me please for God's sake and the children's sakes and lives please do what you can and send me some help, will you? I cannot find any work. I am willing to take any kind of work if I could get it now. Thanksgiven dinner was black coffee and bread and was very glad to get it. My wife is in the hospital now. We have no shoes to were; no clothes, hardly. Of what will I do I sure will thank you.

A pitifully small measure of rural relief is being extended by the American Friends Service Committee, according to Clarence E. Pickett, its secretary. "Last spring," Mr. Pickett said, "the chief of the Children's Bureau, Miss Abbott, and the assistant director of the President's Committee on Unemployment Relief, Mr. Croxton, came to us with disturbing stories about the situation in some of the mining communities, particularly in West Virginia and Kentucky, where

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the miners were suffering from lack of food and clothing. They asked us if we would consider going in to see that the worst spots were taken care of, particularly the children in those spots. They would like to have had us cover the whole need, but we are a small organization with limited resources." The Friends agreed to go in, however, and have been doing what they can to the utmost of their resources and ability. Mr. Pickett said one of the committee's chief difficulties was to get at some of the "small mines, often located in very out-of-the-way places. . . . little, isolated communities where the mine has closed and where the miners have not got out. Even where some have left, there is still a residue left in the company houses, and they are often in very serious distress."

Frank Bane, director of the American Association of Public Welfare Officials, presented a report covering a country-wide survey of relief conditions made by his organization. Again and again in the report there were references to situations in desperate need of attention. Both Williamson and Franklin counties in Illinois, for example, "have deplorable conditions, with the counties literally bankrupt, county relief cut off, banks closed, and few mines running even on part time. People literally have no money, and there is actual destitution and suffering in abandoned mining villages."

That the need is great, that the "calamity we are facing now," to quote one of the witnesses, "will turn out to be much worse than any catastrophe of war" can hardy be doubted. The social workers who testified have their special jobs to attend to; they cannot be expected to have information covering the whole country; they cannot be expected to work out a nation-wide program of relief. For this task one naturally looks to the President's Organization on Unemployment Relief, the only national body solely and directly concerned with the problem. One looks more particularly to the director of that organization, Walter S. Gifford. He was the industrial genius, the master-mind, whose great organizing skill was to go far toward solving the problem. What does he or his organization know of the scope and details of the relief question? Can they tell us how many hungry people there are in America, or how much money is needed to feed and clothe these people? Mr. Gifford's own testimony on this point is most eloquent. Let the record speak for itself:

SENATOR COSTIGAN: How many people are out of work and on the verge of want in the United States?

MR. GIFFORD: I do not think anybody knows, but I will give you a guess.

SENATOR COSTIGAN: You are in an exceptionally good position to make an estimate, are you not?

MR. GIFFORD: Well, I could make a total estimate, but when you come to every little village, town, and hamlet, it is difficult.

SENATOR COSTIGAN: Before you make your estimate, will you tell us what you actually do know as head of the President's Unemployment Relief Committee as to present actual needs in the United States? Is your definite information as to unemployment needs confined to certain cities in the United States?

MR. GIFFORD: Well, I have no definite information, nor has any city definite information.

SENATOR COSTIGAN: You do not know definitely how many unemployed persons in need of assistance are to be found within the borders of the Union at this time?

MR. GIFFORD: No; and you could not know, because I have people that I individually am helping and undoubtedly you are and they are in need of assistance, but there is no record of that and never will be.

SENATOR COSTIGAN: We have had, however, some very definite estimates as to unemployment in certain parts of the country. They have been obviously conservative estimates, but a committee reported that last summer in Pennsylvania there were between 900,000 and 1,000,000 unemployed. The present estimate puts the figure in Pennsylvania somewhat in excess of 1,000,000 people. Do you regard that as a conservative estimate?

MR. GIFFORD: I do not know. I think that might be all right. I do not know what the working population of Pennsylvania is.

SENATOR COSTIGAN: We have had estimates of New York City of approximately 750,000 people out of work and more or less in need at this time. Do you agree with that as a conservative estimate?

MR. GIFFORD: I think I do. I think that is perhaps all right.

SENATOR COSTIGAN: We have had a corresponding estimate for the State of New York, where, it is stated, there are in excess of 1,500,000 people out of work and more or less in need. Is that in accordance with your understanding?

MR. GIFFORD: There may be that number out of work, but I do not know as I would classify the whole million and a half as in need.

SENATOR COSTIGAN: Could you give us your estimate of how many in New York State are in need?

MR. GIFFORD: No; I could not.

SENATOR COSTIGAN: Can you make an estimate for Illinois, where we were advised the other day there are approximately 1,100,000 unemployed?

MR. GIFFORD: I could not do that.

SENATOR COSTIGAN: Is your information similarly indefinite with respect to the rest of the country?

MR. GIFFORD: Yes, sir.

SENATOR COSTIGAN: The best information I believe we have is in the cities where relief work is more or less organized and community chests have been operating. Am I correct about that?

MR. GIFFORD: I think the best statistics would be available there; yes.

SENATOR COSTIGAN: Do you know or does anyone else whom you can turn to know what the relief needs are in the smaller cities which have no community-chest organizations?

MR. GIFFORD: No; I do not know.

SENATOR COSTIGAN: Do you know what the relief needs are in the rural districts of the United States?

MR. GIFFORD: No.

But enough. There are pages upon pages of this sort of testimony from Mr. Gifford. However, toward the end he struck a note of hope, and this was remarked by Senator Costigan. "I find it pleasant to be hopeful," Mr. Gifford replied. Mr. Hodson, of New York City, was likewise hopeful. "I believe," he said, "that nobody will starve to death in New York City this winter on the basis of the funds which are now available." An hour later Mr. Murphy, of Philadelphia, was reminding the Senate committee that hungry people "do not die quickly. You can starve for a long while without dying." With his lack of information Mr. Gifford may be hopeful, but in the meantime many of our millions of unemployed will be facing the prospect of starving "for a long while without dying."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

America's Role at the Conference*

By DAVID W. WAINHOUSE

THE United States will hold the balance of power at the General Disarmament Conference. No other nation stands in such a position to swing the conference into high success as does the United States. But the forces which have contributed to her greatness as the leading world Power are the very forces which now hold her from sharing the responsibilities and obligations of world leadership. Geography has decreed for her security, and the political philosophy of a nineteenth-century agricultural society the tradition of isolation. The twentieth century finds the United States preeminent in the Western Hemisphere, still secured by the Atlantic on the east and the Pacific on the west, with an agricultural society transformed into an industrial one. This transformation in the structure of American society, as in the societies of many other nations, has led to a material interdependence of states which cannot be squared with the tradition of isolation. No longer does the United States live within the confines of a defined geographic area, but in the world. Thus, while the new economic life has outstripped national boundaries, it seems hardly to have been taken account of by the politicians, who still continue to worship isolation with an eighteenth-century mentality. The world will be thrust back to a parochial economy if it does not reconcile the material interdependence of states with their political autonomy.

Isolation, or, stated in another way, Senatorial aversion to political commitments in Europe, has driven the State Department to espouse the "disarmament-school" philosophy, a philosophy which conceives armaments as dependent on technical quantity rather than on political quality. Yet the little progress which has been made in agreement on naval armaments between the United States, Great Britain, and Japan denies the utility of the "disarmament-school" thesis. Naval agreements between these Powers were made possible only because naval armaments were approached in political and not in technical or mathematical terms.

When, in 1921, Mr. Hughes proposed the 5:5:3 capital-ship symbol for the United States, Great Britain, and Japan, political questions forced themselves in by more than one door, and the Washington conference on the reduction and limitation of armaments resolved itself into a conference on the politics of the Pacific and the Atlantic.

The problem of security—that old League problem—then raised its head in a different guise before tons and guns could be measured. It was met for the United States when the Anglo-Japanese alliance, which constituted a threat against her, was canceled; it was met for Japan when the three greatest naval Powers agreed to maintain the status quo of fortifications and naval bases within a specified area of the Pacific Ocean; it was met for Japan again in the Four-Power Consultation Pact, which, in effect, assured her against an Anglo-American naval combination in the Pacific; it was met for Great Britain and the United States in the Atlantic when Great Britain acceded to the demands of the United States for equality with respect to naval strength.

Thus, not until political foundations were laid was an agreement on naval armaments between these three nations possible. The experience and lessons of the Washington conference of 1921-22, of the abortive Geneva naval conference of 1927, and of the London naval conference of 1930 are sufficiently dear and clear for the United States to judge the future by the past.

Before discussing how much the United States has contributed to laying a political groundwork for the limitation and reduction of armaments in the preparatory stages of the conference, let us consider the three major technical problems which the American delegation will have to face at Geneva —trained reserves, battleships, and budgetary limitation.

Trained Reserves. The issue here is whether trained reserves should be included in estimating the military strength of a nation. The United States has held that trained reserves should be counted in measuring a nation's military strength. Ambassador Hugh Gibson, in setting forth the American view before the Preparatory Commission, contended that "a nation which possesses an adequately equipped trained reserve is in a position promptly to undertake offensive battle." France, however, speaking for herself as well as for the other nations with a compulsory military system, has refused to yield and has declared that "the safeguarding of the vital principles underlying her national defense does not allow her to make any concessions in regard to trained reserves." In the sixth session of the Preparatory Commission (April, 1929) the United States abandoned her opposition and deferred to the views of the conscriptionist nations for the sake of reaching an agreement. With Great Britain and this country committed to let France have her own way in the matter of trained reserves, French armed dominance on the continent of Europe becomes assured. It is idle for the United States to argue that the problem of limiting land armies is purely a European problem and no concern to her as a military nation. While it is true that the American army is on a skeleton basis and constitutes no threat to any Power, the question whether or not France is to remain in complete military domination over Europe is of the greatest importance to the United States as well as to the rest of the world. The disparity existing between Germany and her former allies, who are in a condition of practical disarmament, as against France and her military allies, who have increased their armaments, "has produced an instability of attitude in the center of Europe, which attitude has produced repercussions of a political and financial nature which extend far beyond Europe." The quoted words are those which Secretary of State Stimson used before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. To allow France and her allies to continue in the possession of these huge armies is simply to perpetuate the condition of European instability with its resulting world chaos.

Battleships. At the present time the United States is the only nation which insists upon the retention of battle-

* An introductory article by Mr. Wainhouse, The Disarmament Conference Meets, appeared in last week's issue.—EDITOR THE NATION.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ships of 35,000 tons. To cut down the size of these battleships, argue the professional sailors, would place the United States in a position of relative naval inferiority with respect to Great Britain and Japan. The American battleship fleet is in a "period of transition," and the destiny of battleships must wait until the naval conference which is scheduled to meet in 1935.

There can be little doubt that ever since the Washington conference battleships have started their march to the grave. No nation has laid down any new battleships since 1921, and not even France or Italy has exercised the right accorded by the Washington conference to replace the 70,000 tons of obsolete battleships.

Great Britain favors not only the reduction of the size of battleships but their eventual abolition. She has already indicated that at the conference she will press for a reduction in the size of battleships. In this she will have the support of France and Italy, and the cooperation of Japan. If the United States resists she will be placed in a position of being the lone defender of these costly floating mastodons.

Budgetary Limitation. The United States has consistently objected to limiting armaments by limiting the amount to be spent on them. She and Germany are the two Powers that have interposed a veto whenever the issue arose in the Preparatory Commission. The German objection has been based on the convincing argument that it is not fair to add budgetary limitation on top of the direct limitation already imposed on her by the Treaty of Versailles. Germany, by unlimited expenditure, has in the past decade made up in quality what she lacks in quantity. The American objection has never been made clear. In 1927 Mr. Gibson contended that it would be unjust to the United States to compare her armament expenditures with those of other countries in view of the higher cost basis. That is a sound argument. But no one has ever suggested that the comparison should be made between the military budgets of one country and those of another, but rather between the succeeding annual budgets of the same country. When the high-cost argument was shown to be based on a misunderstanding of the workings of the principle, it was suggested that budgetary limitation would be unconstitutional inasmuch as the Senate, by a treaty, could not contract away the appropriation power of the House. This argument, too, seems unreal. If the number of battleships the navy is to possess can be limited by the treaty-making power, why cannot a treaty limit the amount to be spent on them? Another argument which has been advanced is that the budgetary system of limitation is an impossible one from the point of accountancy. If the War Department spends money on harbor and river improvements and conducts in part some of the insular affairs, how, it is asked, can the war items be kept separate from the non-war items? But no accountant worthy of the name, not even a government accountant, would take this argument seriously.

Budgetary limitation is something which is readily understood by the man in the street. It is effective, clear, controllable, and workable. It is the only way the world can know what its war bill is. The Budgetary Experts' Committee has reported that it is a practicable method and has drawn up a definite plan for the conference to consider. The United States virtually holds the sole veto of this system of limitation. It seems incredible that Mr. Stimson and Mr. Hoover, who are anxious to cooperate whole-heartedly in making the conference a success, will hold out against budgetary limitation. They should subscribe to this method notwithstanding the desire of the big-navy interests to build up to the levels of the London naval treaty.

Mathematical formulae, symbolic ratios, and technical criteria alone will not solve the problem of aggressive armaments which exist to carry out national policies. The problem of disarmament is fundamentally political, and the solution of it lies outside the mere consideration of the technical problems in the limitation and reduction of armaments. To what use will these armaments be put? This is the question which France has put to the world, and the United States, as a leading member in the world community, will have to give an answer. Self-defense? The term is a blind. At the London naval conference the respective chiefs of the five Powers all pleaded that their armaments were purely defensive; yet it was the fear that these might be used offensively which brought them together. And it is the same fear which is bringing them together again at Geneva.

America's foreign policy is at stake in the disarmament conference. Aloofness from European politics has been one of the permanent bases of America's foreign policy. It has been a policy which has prevented Great Britain from taking her obligations under the League Covenant seriously. If France should again request from Great Britain military guaranties as a *quid pro quo* for armament reduction, the answer will depend largely on what the United States will do in case Great Britain is called upon to honor her military commitments on the continent of Europe. Will the United States insist on her neutral rights and attempt to give aid and comfort to a nation which has broken the pledge to settle all disputes by peaceful means when the British navy is engaged in running down the aggressor? Great Britain's attitude toward the League is dependent upon the answer to this question.

The disarmament policy of the United States has been shaped and in large measure dictated by the Senate under its constitutional authority of giving advice and consent to agreements entered into by the Executive. The Senatorial habit of modifying and amending treaties, even of rejecting them entirely, has made the State Department a creature of the Senate. While the State Department has become international-minded, the Senate remains incased in the eighteenth-century political thought still current in the regions of Idaho. The Senator who votes to outlaw war one day demands the codification of the laws of war the next.

Under these circumstances the State Department has shown daring and courage in the preparatory stages of the conference, not only in having adhered to a consultation clause, but in having initiated and proposed it. This is a matter of far-reaching importance and has not received the attention which it deserves. The consultation clause is Article 50 of the Draft Convention and is worth quoting in full:

> If, during the term of the present convention, a change of circumstances constitutes, in the opinion of any High Contracting Party, a menace to its national security, such High Contracting Party may suspend temporarily, in so far as concerns itself, any provision or provisions of the present convention, other than those expressly designed to apply in the event of war, provided:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(a) That such Contracting Party shall immediately notify the other Contracting Parties and at the same time the Permanent Disarmament Commission, through the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, of such temporary suspension, and of the extent thereof.

(b) That simultaneously with the said notification, the Contracting Party shall communicate to the other Contracting Parties, and at the same time to the Permanent Disarmament Commission through the Secretary-General, a full explanation of the change of circumstances referred to above.

Thereupon the other High Contracting Parties shall promptly advise as to the situation thus presented.

When the reasons for such temporary suspension have ceased to exist, the said High Contracting Party shall reduce its armaments to the level agreed upon in the convention, and shall make immediate notification to the other Contracting Parties.

The principle of international consultation will form the center toward which the problem of the limitation and reduction of armaments will gravitate at Geneva. It will be the heart of the arms agreement.

The consultation clause bears interestingly on the Briand-Kellogg pact. For the past two years Mr. Stimson has had it in mind to propose the adding of a "third article" to the pact, an article which would oblige the signatories to consult in case of a violation or a threatened violation. Consultation envisaged in Article 50 provides this "third article." In fact, Article 50 brings within the orbit what the pact by implication excepted, namely, a war of self-defense when that war is coupled with a suspension or violation of the arms agreement. In this respect it encompasses a wider range of action, for it involves questions of war whether defensive or offensive. The United States is thus doing through an arms agreement what President Wilson attempted in part to do through the Covenant of the League of Nations more than a decade ago.

Consultation under Article 50 is the first stage preceding its very object—combined international action against the disturber of the peace. It is a form of sanction, and since it operates automatically, it may in time change the character of private war.

The primary task of the General Disarmament Conference is to build the political foundations for an arms agreement. The conference can begin by setting up a Permanent Disarmament Commission (discussed in the first article), by concluding an agreement to consult, and by limiting armaments by the budgetary method. This must be the groundwork in the immensely complicated business of disarmament. If the American delegation returns with an arms agreement incorporating these three principles, it will have reached the first stage in the difficult journey. And the Senate, however isolationist, will not dare to reject it if American public opinion is bent on sharing the responsibilities for building a well-ordered world.

Bakers' Bread: Costly and Tasteless

By WINIFRED RAUSHENBUSH

As everybody knows, we have a wheat surplus. And as everybody knows, the unemployed and 2,000,000 wheat farmers are tightening their belts. Bankruptcies in the wheat regions are increasing at a shocking rate, and the United States Department of Agriculture predicts that the American wheat farmer will not sell much wheat to Europe before 1935 or 1936, and that he had better face the fact that he may, in the future, have to produce wheat for the domestic market only. What is the wheat farmer to do?

Between 1904 and 1914 Americans consumed 80 per cent of the American wheat crop. At no time has our population consumed less than 60 per cent of the wheat raised in this country. The American wheat farmer's biggest customer is, obviously, the American people. And how is the wheat farmer getting on with his biggest customer? Very poorly. The per capita consumption of wheat has been declining steadily since 1913. According to the Food Research Institute of Stanford University, the per capita consumption of wheat specifically for food, rather than for other purposes, is lower in the United States than in any other country for which there are trustworthy statistics. Under the Czar, Ivan Smith of Russia ate 2.9 bushels of wheat. He now eats 4.1 bushels. At the time Ivan Smith was eating 2.9 bushels—in 1909-10—John Smith of America was eating 5.3 bushels. Today he is eating only 4.6 bushels. What is the trouble? What is wrong with the American wheat farmer's biggest and most important customer?

The trouble is that Americans don't eat wheat; they eat bread. Midway between the American people and the American farmer with his unsold wheat, which in July, 1930, amounted to 265,000,000 bushels, stands a middleman—the baking industry. What is wrong with the bread produced by the American baking industry? Isn't it wrapped in glazed paper? Isn't it strictly fresh? Isn't it delivered twice a day to suburban back doors by ardent bread salesmen, at the cost of an extra cent a pound? Isn't it "the Kind Mother Used to Make"? It is not. Half of the bread eaten by contemporary Americans and most of the bread eaten by Americans living in cities is bakers' bread. The trouble with bakers' bread is that the Joneses don't like it and the Sweeneys can't afford it.

In 1919 there were about 300,000 baking establishments in the country, 279,000 of which, or 93 per cent, were run by hole-in-the-cellar bakers, who produced about one-half of the bread and collected about one-half of the profits of the industry. None of these 279,000 small bakers produced more than $20,000 worth of bakery products annually. The other half of the profits went to 21,000 big bakers, including such companies as Ward, Continental, General, and Purities, none of which produced less than $100,000 worth of bakery products annually. These 21,000 bakers, representing only 7 per cent of the industry, were able to produce about half of America's bread and collect about half of the profits. That their production volume is as high as stated is shown not only by the Kyrk and Davis monograph, "The Baking In-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dustry," which appeared in 1922, but by a report of the Federal Trade Commission published in 1928, which says:

> Probably one-half or more of the total commercial bread is produced and sold by a comparatively small number of companies. In 1925, 57 companies, including three chain-store systems operating 278 plants, produced and sold more than 30 per cent of the total commercial production of that year.

It is highly probable that if the big bakers chose, they could do better than this. They do not choose. The relation between the big bakers and the little bakers is extremely cooperative. The big bakers do not push the little baker out of existence; they help him. The help is extended through the officials of bakers' associations. The secretary of one of these associations said of his work: "It's a great deal of satisfaction attending some of these smaller meetings where the bakers need some practical help in ironing out their difficulties. Some of the work may touch on the illegal, but without it many would drag along broke or near-broke." The little baker helps the big baker by charging a high price for bread, because he is poor and inefficient and his production costs are high, and the big baker helps the little baker by not undercutting the little bakers' price. This arrangement enables the little baker to remain in existence, and the big baker to collect the huge profits which are the difference between a low cost of production and a high price.

The price of bread increased by 35 per cent between 1913 and 1927. During the seven prosperous years between 1922 and 1929 it averaged 9.1 cents, as contrasted with a pre-war price of 5.9 cents and a 1931 depression price which occasionally reached a low of 5 cents per pound. It is difficult to find any sound economic reason for the high price of bread during the nineteen twenties. The wheat farmer was already in distress in 1923, when his export markets collapsed, and the present wheat surplus has been piling up since 1925. Dr. Kyrk, of the department of economics of the University of Chicago, states in her monograph referred to above that statistics showed that prior to 1922 rents, taxes, wages, salaries, and total specified costs were lower in the baking industry than the average for manufacturing industries generally. According to the cost-of-living index of the National Conference Board, the index of bread has been from 2 to 24 points higher than the average for food prices generally during the ten years between 1920 and 1930. The Federal Trade Commission, which made an investigation of the baking industry between 1924 and 1928, cites the case of Mr. Win Campbell, president of the Campbell Baking Company, who lowered the price of his bread to 5.7 cents a pound in 1922, when bread was 8.7 cents a pound. On being asked to resign from a bakers' association of which he happened to be president, Mr. Campbell assured the other bakers that he could sell bread at this price and still make a profit. The commission's report notes that a few years later Mr. Campbell's company was again charging the customary prices of the industry. There is, finally, the testimony of the trade press. The *Northwestern Miller* of January 28, 1925, says:

> For three full years the baking industry has enjoyed an enormous unearned increment. In all this time the retail price of bread fluctuated hardly at all, while the cost of raw materials went steadily down until last summer. No wonder it seemed that commercial baking was an inexhaustible gold mine.

In 1924 the Senate asked the Federal Trade Commission to investigate the baking industry. The Senate suspected that bread prices were being maintained at an extraordinarily high and uniform level by price fixing and some form of monopoly. Its research agent, the Federal Trade Commission, was not able to prove this. But its report did indicate quite clearly the methods by which bread prices remained uniform and high.

In making their golden profits the big bakers of the industry follow five simple principles: first, never lower the price of bread unless you have to; second, raise the price of bread when wheat goes up; third, if investigated, push the hole-in-the-cellar baker and his high-production costs to the fore; fourth, maintain high prices by being kind to the little baker; fifth, work out an essential monopoly among the big baking companies by means of joint stock ownership and interlocking directorates, but do not let this monopoly become overt.

One of the methods which the baking industry used to raise the price of bread at a time when the price of wheat had gone up will illustrate its general procedure. In 1925 the price of flour was raised from $1.27 to $1.45. On January 30, 1925, Dr. Harry Everett Barnard, secretary-treasurer of the American Bakers Association, was interviewed by the Chicago *Tribune*. On January 31 the *Tribune* published the interview under the following headlines: "Expert Predicts Boost in Bread Here Soon—Thinks 1 to 2 Cents More Is Justified." On February 5 two Minneapolis papers announced that bread was to be raised 1 cent per pound. On February 6 the Purities Baking Corporation, one of the four largest companies, announced an increase of 1 cent per pound on bread. And a few days later Expert Barnard received a letter from Baker Bolder, saying, "That was a dandy article in the *Tribune*."

The baking industry's customers fall into two classes: the Joneses and the Sweeneys. It is obvious that the Sweeneys are the more important market because there are more of them. In 1918 there were less than 6,000,000 Joneses and more than 34,000,000 Sweeneys. The distinction between the Joneses and the Sweeneys is that the gainfully employed Joneses make more than $2,000 a year and the gainfully employed Sweeneys make less.

The United States Department of Agriculture recommends that a typical census family of five persons eat ten pounds of bread a week. The annual cost of this bread quota at Mr. Campbell's price of 5.7 cents a pound would have been $29.64. The annual cost at the price charged by the baking industry during the same year—8.7 cents a pound—would have been $47.32. The difference to the consumer would have been $17.86, or 37 per cent of his annual bread bill.

Could the Sweeneys afford to buy the recommended quota of bread at the prices the baking industry was charging during the nineteen twenties? Could they afford these prices during the boom years between 1922 and 1929? Some of the Sweeneys could not. Between 1922 and 1929 there were never less than 1,400,000 unemployed Sweeneys. During this same period from 5 to 10 per cent of the school children of the United States were undernourished. According to Professor Nystrom of the department of economics of Columbia University, there were during these years probably 9,000,000 persons—men, women, and children

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—who were living below the subsistence level. Approximately one person out of every twelve, during the Seven Fat Years of our prosperity, was hungry.

In addition to the 9,000,000 sub-subsistence-level Sweeneys there were millions of other Sweeneys living just at or just above the subsistence level, to whom the price of bread also mattered. "Economic Behavior," a textbook published in 1931 by New York University, says in describing American consumers:

> Comparison of income figures with estimates of necessary expenditure suggests that in 1918 nearly 27,000,000 American workers were unable to maintain a family in health and decency. Only about 10,500,000 could attain that standard and only about 5,250,000 could maintain families in comfort. More recent studies of income indicate that in 1926 the average income received by a gainfully employed person was $1,799, and that if the income of the highest 10 per cent is disregarded, the rest averaged $1,341. Comparison of the estimates of incomes needed with the incomes actually received will show that the margin separating the American population from distress is not large.

If, as the conclusions of economists seem to show, there were approximately 9,000,000 sub-subsistence-level Sweeneys and an additional 10,000,000 to 18,000,000 sub-efficiency-level Sweeneys during the Seven Fat Years from 1922 to 1929, it is clear that millions of Americans could not afford the high prices charged by the baking industry for a loaf of bread.

The Sweeneys of America were during the nineteen twenties and are now paying more than they can afford for bread, or they are buying less bread. The Joneses are buying less bread than they used to, and not eating all of that. The super-Joneses prefer cake, broccoli, alligator pears, and even carrots and spinach, and the plain Joneses follow their example.

What influences have steered the super-Joneses in the direction of lowered wheat consumption? The first influence was science, which the Joneses venerate highly. Doctors and nutrition experts questioned the value of white bread. The Joneses promptly became suspicious of white bread and began to demand whole wheat. The second influence was patriotism. The United States started an eat-less-wheat campaign during the war, and the Joneses responded loyally. They even began to do without bread in the restaurants which were charging extra for a bread order. The third influence was fashion. The flapper fashions did not encourage avoirdupois, and dieting came into vogue. Starches and breads were not allowed on these reducing diets. The Joneses who still craved bread ate imported breads, guaranteed not to increase weight. The imported breads were expensive. This fact made the dieting Joneses feel better about them. Besides, they tasted much better than American bread.

It is obvious that fashion has had a great deal to do with the decreasing bread consumption of the Joneses. Giving up white bread and adopting whole wheat was a fashion trend. Eating less bread during the war was a fashion, sanctioned by the government itself. And dieting was a fashion made necessary by the Paris dressmakers. Veblen has enunciated one of the important principles relating to fashion changes. The principle is this: If there is to be ready acceptance of a new fashion, there must first be considerable dissatisfaction with the old fashion. This principle helps to explain why per capita flour consumption has been declining since 1904 and per capita wheat consumption since 1913. It indicates that dissatisfaction with American bread must have begun at about this time. The factor that caused this dissatisfaction was commercial bread. Prior to 1900 the baking industry was of negligible importance. In 1900 the annual per capita consumption of bakery products in the United States was only $2.33. During the nineteen hundreds and nineteen tens the baking industry expanded with great rapidity, and by 1923 the annual per capita consumption of bakery products had increased to $10.15.

If the Joneses were not dissatisfied with home-made bread and if they were dissatisfied with commercial bread, then there must be a considerable difference between the two products. It is impossible to say precisely what this difference is, since American bakers have never been willing to make explicit statements about their bread formulae. The National Wheat Conference, however, which met to save the farmer in 1923, knew enough about wheat and commercial-baking practices to supply an important clue to the difference between home-made bread and bakers' bread. The conference, like the United States Department of Agriculture, was interested at this time in stimulating consumption of wheat in the home market to make up for the loss of our European markets. It therefore adopted the following resolution relating to the baking industry: "We urge the production by the baking industry universally of the highest possible quality of bread as an effective means to stimulating its increased consumption. Such bread requires the use of the highest grade of patent flour, *similar to that used almost exclusively in home baking.*"

Nutrition experts agree that although bread depends for its vitamin content on yeast, and for part of its nutritive value on milk, it depends for its taste on the kind and quality of flour used. The reason the Joneses were so ready to give up eating bread was because the taste of American bakers' bread is so negative.

The baking industry is as stupid as it is greedy. Its first mistake lay in assuming that because bread was the staff of life people would always buy it. Its second mistake lay in assuming that it could manufacture a tasteless, high-priced food and compete in the open market with cheap, well-flavored foods. Its third mistake lay in not manufacturing an attractive whole-wheat loaf, when the value of white bread was called into question.

If the wheat farmer knows his markets he will keep an eye on the baking industry. He will watch the weight, the price, and the quality of commercial bread. Further, he will resell the public on the food value and the appetizing taste of commercial bread, even if it means going into the baking business. If the wheat farmer is too hard pressed and unorganized to safeguard his markets, there is nothing for him to do but to sit back and watch the American demand for wheat suffer a slow but steady decline. And there is nothing for the hungry Sweeneys to do either, except, perhaps, to emigrate. To the Argentine perhaps, where the government has taken over the baking industry and cut the price of bread from 3.5 to 2 cents a pound. Or to Russia, where almost no one wears Paris clothes, but where there are plenty of jobs and where the per capita consumption of wheat and rye, combined, is the highest in the world.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mahatma Gandhi Meets Romain Rolland

[*To an American friend Romain Rolland has written as follows about the visit of Mahatma Gandhi to his home.*—EDITOR THE NATION.]

Villeneuve, Switzerland, December, 1931

HOW I should have liked to have you here during the visit of the Indians! They stayed five days—from Sunday night until Friday afternoon, the eleventh—at the Villa Lionette. The little man, bespectacled and toothless, was wrapped in his white burnoose, but his legs, thin as a heron's stilts, were bare. His shaven head with its few coarse hairs was uncovered and wet with rain. He came to me with a dry laugh, his mouth open, like a good dog panting, and flinging an arm around me leaned his cheek against my shoulder. I felt his grizzled head against my cheek. It was, I amuse myself thinking, the kiss of St. Dominic and St. Francis.

Then came Mira [Miss Slade], proud of figure and with the stately bearing of a Demeter, and finally three Indians, one a young son of Gandhi, Devidas, with a round and happy face. He is gentle, and but little aware of the grandeur of his name. The others were secretaries—disciples—two young men of rare qualities of heart and mind: Mahadev Desai and Pyarelal.

As I had contrived shortly beforehand to get a severe cold on my chest, it was to my house and to the chamber on the second floor where I sleep at Villa Olga—you will remember it—that Gandhi came each morning for long conversations. My sister interpreted, with the assistance of Mira, and I had also a Russian friend and secretary, Miss Kondacheff, who took notes on our discussions. Some good photographs by Schlemmer, our neighbor from Montreux, recorded the aspect of our interviews.

Evenings, at seven o'clock, prayers were held in the first-floor salon. With lights lowered, the Indians seated on the carpet, and a little assembly of the faithful grouped about, there was a suite of three beautiful chants—the first an extract from the Gita, the second an ancient hymn on the Sanskrit texts which Gandhi has translated, and the third a canticle of Rama and Siva, intoned by the warm, grave voice of Mira.

Gandhi held other prayers at three o'clock in the morning, for which, in London, he used to wake his harassed staff, although he had not retired until one. This little man, so frail in appearance, is tireless, and fatigue is a word which does not exist in his vocabulary. He could calmly answer for hours the heckling of a crowd, as he did at Lausanne and Geneva, without a muscle of his face twitching. Seated on a table, motionless, his voice always clear and calm, he replied to his adversaries open or masked—and they were not lacking at Geneva—giving them rude truths which left them silenced and suffocated.

The Roman bourgeoisie, militarist and nationalist, who had at first received him with crafty looks, quivered with rage when he left. I believe that if his stay had lasted any longer the public meetings would have been forbidden. He pronounced himself as unequivocally as possible on the double question of national armaments and the conflict between capital and labor. I was largely responsible for steering him on this latter course.

His mind proceeds through successive experiments into action and he follows a straight line, but he never stops, and one would risk error in attempting to judge him by what he said ten years ago, because his thought is in constant evolution. I will give you a little example of it that is characteristic.

He was asked at Lausanne to define what he understood by God. He explained how, among the noblest attributes which the Hindu scriptures ascribed to God, he had in his youth chosen the word "truth" as most truly defining the essential element. He had then said, "God is Truth." "But," he added, "two years ago I advanced another step. I now say, 'Truth is God.' For even the atheists do not doubt the necessity for the power of truth. In their passion for discovering the truth, the atheists have not hesitated to deny the existence of God, and, from their point of view, they are right." You will understand from this single trait the boldness and independence of this religious spirit from the Orient. I noted in him traits similar to Vivikananda.

And yet not a single political ruse catches him unprepared. And his own politics are to say everything that he thinks to everybody, not concealing a thing.

On the last evening, after the prayers, Gandhi asked me to play him a little of Beethoven. (He does not know Beethoven, but he knows that Beethoven has been the intermediary between Mira and me,* and consequently between Mira and himself, and that, in the final count, it is to Beethoven that the gratitude of us all must go.) I played him the Andante of the Fifth Symphony. To that I added "Les Champs Elysées" of Gluck—the page for the orchestra and the air for the flute.

He is very sensitive to the religious chants of his country, which somewhat resemble the most beautiful of our Gregorian melodies, and he has worked to assemble them. We also exchanged our ideas on art, from which he does not separate his conception of truth, nor from his conception of truth that of joy, which he thinks truth should bring. But it follows of itself that for this heroic nature joy does not come without effort, nor even life itself without hardship. "The seeker after truth hath a heart tender as the lotus, and hard as granite."

Here, my dear friend, are a few hints of those days of ours together on which I have taken much more detailed notes. What I do not dwell on to you is the hurricane of intruders, loiterers, and half-wits which this visit loosed on our two villas. No, the telephone never ceased ringing;

* Miss Slade joined Mahatma Gandhi at the suggestion of M. Rolland.—EDITOR THE NATION.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

photographers in ambuscades let fly their fusillades from behind every bush. The milkmen's syndicate at Leman informed me that during all the time of this sojourn with me of the "King of India" they intended to assume complete responsibility for his "victualling." We received letters from "Sons of God." Some Italians wrote to the Mahatma beseeching him to indicate for them the ten lucky numbers for the next drawing of the weekly national lottery!

My sister, having survived, has gone to take ten days' rest at a cure in Zurich. She returns tomorrow. For my part, I have entirely lost the gift of sleep. If you find it, send it to me by registered mail!

Controlling Foreign Loans

By MORRIS L. ERNST

THE investors in South and Central American bonds have lost most of their money. That is too bad but relatively unimportant. The Senatorial inquiry inspired and conducted by Senator Hiram Johnson has, however, pointed to many more lamentable results of our foreign banking policy. Although I am in no way in agreement with Senator Johnson's attitude toward the moratorium and reparations, nevertheless I admire his single-handed efforts to drag out of reluctant witnesses their tawdry tales of bribery and waste. He has elicited testimony which indicates something less than impartial integrity on the part of public officials in the State and Commerce departments.

This hearing is not a criminal trial. The proof needed to inspire legislative remedies may properly fall short of a test of "beyond a reasonable doubt." To any objective person the evidence calls for immediate Congressional action, at least to restate and clarify our national position in the field of foreign financing. Assuming that the bankers were not parties to the illegitimate disbursements accompanying loans, assuming that the State Department was not overenergetic in behalf of Mr. Mellon's oil stake in the Barco concession, assuming that the Commerce Department was not adequately equipped honestly to render opinions as to the commercial aspects of Peruvian financing, nevertheless, all three of these groups must feel quite uncomfortable about their public positions. Certain obvious reforms should be inaugurated without question. The following measures would make financing more respectable and would remove some of the present suspicion from the State and Commerce departments:

1. No government employee, upon leaving the State or Commerce Department, should be permitted for a reasonable time to engage in any field of work connected with the field or staff of his previous employment. Thus we should prevent the stealing of ministers, the buying of assistant secretaries, and the purchasing of attachés by the banking interests. At present public employees necessarily have one eye on the public interest and the other on their future employment. The governmental turnover is excessive; public servants have constantly before their gaze the bribe of bank interests; and their subsequent employment is not entirely divorced from the area of wire-pulling. A similar restriction has been created in many other departments—for example, in the case of income-tax employees and Federal Reserve Board officials. The duration of the limitation can easily be agreed upon. Two years should be adequate as a trial.

2. No government employee, particularly in the State Department, should be permitted to act for compensation or otherwise in behalf of any private interests. The present legislation on this subject is not broad enough to cover officials or high plenipotentiaries. Such practice should be stopped; we should also condemn by legislation the drafting of private bankers' agreements by ministers.

3. It should be made unlawful to name any government officials, such as the President of the United States, justices of the Supreme Court, or even lesser lights, as arbiters under loan agreements. Such provisions in the agreements are obviously unenforceable and should not be permitted to exist for the mere purpose of duress.

After thus aiding the integrity of the public servants, Congress should enunciate what control, if any, our government should have over foreign financing. Should we return to the old days when there was a free market in money and the government as such was not even consulted? If we are past that era of nationalism, then we must decide what power should be placed in the government departments. Should the State Department have a veto power or be merely advisory? If the latter, shall we need legislation to guard against preferential treatment or duress by the State Department?

For nearly a decade the State Department has exercised an effective veto power. On four grounds the Secretary of State could quash a loan:

1. No money should travel to countries which we did not recognize. This is obviously unenforceable because loans to Germany in fact must have released credits to Russia.

2. No money should flow for the purpose of munitions. This can be circumvented so easily that any decision made by the Department of State would be the laughing-stock of borrowers as well as lenders. The Vickers munition payment resulting from the Dillon, Reed loan in Bolivia is a case in point. Any formula we adopt in this connection should not overlook the coincidental sales by American airplane or munition manufacturers to borrowing nations.

3. No loan should be made unless the budget of the borrowing government balanced. A strict interpretation of this rule would have barred many of our foreign issues. But if such a veto power were sound policy, obviously Congress would have to set up a proper public machinery for the determination of these budgetary facts.

4. No loan should be made in connection with a monopoly. Here again we have a field of difficult determination, and in any event the Commerce Department would be better equipped for reaching a determination than any other branch of the government. If Congress should believe that this fourth classification was a proper basis for absolute veto, where should the power rest—in the State Department or in the Department of Commerce?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A further field of legislative inquiry concerns itself with the banking industry of the United States. The bankers at this moment are genuinely embarrassed when faced with any of their customers to whom they have sold these foreign securities. The churches, colleges, and foundations that purchased such bond issues no doubt feel some slight sense of shame in having been parties to the acquisition of an obligation born, to say the least, in a corrupting environment.

Foreign loans in ordinary times originated in the needs and minds of the borrowers. The bond issues now under consideration in Washington arose, however, in a reverse fashion. Most banking houses sent high-pressure salesmen out into the markets of the world to see where their money could be placed. High and corrupting inducements were made to invite foreign governments to borrow money, to be spent on idle or doubtful pursuits. Grosvenor Jones of the Department of Commerce, testifying in the recent hearings on foreign loans to the competition for South American bonds among investment houses, made two exceptions, these being J. P. Morgan and Company and Kuhn, Loeb and Company, who "had followed the English tradition of the borrower seeking the lender rather than the lender seeking the borrower." Such practices of the banking world call on Congress, even in its limited field of control, to consider the following:

1. Should not commercial banks be prevented from engaging in the business of dealing in securities?

2. Should not all banks be compelled to give up their security companies, incorporated, as set forth in the certificates of incorporation, to carry on a business illegal under the banking laws?

3. Would not such complete divorce and abnegation from the bond and stock business reduce the degree of undue pressure which can be practiced by banks upon outlying banking institutions to purchase the securities of the underwriting parent bank? A major commercial bank in New York is virtually able to compel all affiliated banks in small towns to purchase securities, and the portfolios of our bankrupt banks might well indicate that the smaller the institution and the less important it was to the parent bank, the more likely it was to have foisted on it the least desirable of securities.

4. We might well consider limiting the amount of long-term securities which any bank may hold. Such limitation could be based on a percentage of the capital and surplus, or of the deposits. A quaint but enticing theory exists to the effect that the moneys of a community deposited with these quasi-public institutions known as banks should be kept primarily for the benefit of the community itself. Limitations of investments in long-term securities, particularly in foreign securities, would be in line with such a theory of banking.

5. It has been suggested with such force that it is worth considering that we set up a procedure whereby all foreign governments desiring money in our market should file their applications with the Federal Reserve Board. There, without power of discrimination, the board could act as public auction block for such securities. The issues then would be sold to the highest bidder much in the same fashion as the various governmental entities in this country sell their city or State bonds. The Federal Reserve Board would have the facilities for handling such impartial sales and would be a proper reservoir for preserving valuable information.

After limiting the scope of banks, Congress should consider the further protection of our American investors, our bankers, and our friendly relations with foreign governments by the following legislative enactments:

1. The public recording of all loan and concession agreements. This would include the contracts and all facts in relation thereto, names of commercial agents, amounts paid, expenses, and so on.

2. In respect to loans the bond agreements should be filed thirty days before the date of closing, so as to allow public comment on the proposed agreements.

3. And, finally, there should be recorded after the sale of the issues a complete statement of the entire transaction, including profits, losses, and all attending circumstances.

Imperialism is a vague term. The present disclosure will do little more than accumulate the evidence of the past. The real story lies hidden in the State Department files—hidden from the people by their alleged servants. For my part, more than all the above devices combined I should prefer a simple enactment of "open covenants openly arrived at." I appreciate that we might be impeded in certain ways, but I doubt whether the embarrassment which the State Department always conjures up when asked for information is any greater than that created by the devious negotiations carried on behind closed doors. Has the secrecy of the past brought us any real protection or friendship with other nations? Why not try for two or three years open, fully disclosed dealings with other friendly governments?

The case for secrecy breaks down when Secretary Stimson offers to disclose his files only to the members of the Senate Finance Committee. Why are those men alone to be trusted with these state secrets? What if the facts disclosed are important? They might suggest some legislative cures to be introduced in the Senate. Then Mr. Stimson will have to urge that the arguments for such federal action should not be advanced by the knowledge gained in the secret committee meetings. And what is this secrecy? Secrecy known to the bankers, read by State Department employees, discussed by Senators—but kept from the electorate.

In the Driftway

THE Drifter knows nothing of economics and less of finance. Now and again, however, he hears a story which seems to bear some relation to what is popularly known as the "depression." For him, its interest is human. He does not know what to do about it; he does not know why it is so. But he rather thinks that somewhere, possibly in Denmark, possibly in many parts of the world, there exists matter in a state of decay! He reads of Mr. Abe Wineberg—which is not his name—who two years ago with his wife and eight children decided to leave New York City for Los Angeles. Mr. Wineberg used to be a cap maker; cap making in New York failed to provide sufficient provender for Isidor, then seventeen, Hyman, fifteen, Fanny, thirteen, Sam, ten, Hilda, six, William, four, Pearl, two, and Solomon, just born. Not to mention Papa and Mama. But in Los Angeles things were not so good either. And the other day the Winebergs came home—if home it can be called. They came at the request of the Los Angeles civic authorities, who obligingly provided their railroad fare to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

get rid of them, and threw in $15 for food. Naturally they sat up all the way, sleeping as they could in the seats of the railroad coach; and Mama held Pearl, now four, and Solomon, a big boy of two, on her lap.

* * * * *

IF the Drifter seems to be telling this story light-heartedly, he hastens to assure his readers that it appears to him distressing to a degree. As far as he is able to ascertain, Los Angeles is still a part of the United States. And why the Winebergs should have been considered more the problem of New York than of the City of the Angels he fails to understand. After all, two years of residence might have given them some claim to attention other than a request to depart. The spectacle of them, disheveled and weary, marching out of the train at Pennsylvania Station, to become more than ever public charges, makes the heart weep. New York, obviously will not welcome them. There is, indeed, in the whole United States today no place where ten Winebergs in addition to all the other unfortunates would find a real welcome. There is no relief agency that would not sigh at the sight of the ten lining up for shelter and warmth and clothing and food. They may, of course, be so dramatically pitiful as to excite more than ordinary sympathy and help. If they do, they will only take from another ten the sustenance they in turn need. There is no escaping the fact—the Winebergs are a problem, in a comfortable and well-ordered democracy.

* * * * *

NOR are they the only problem. The Drifter heard another story the other day. Out in the sheep country of Oregon farmers are killing their ewes. This is not the result of an access of bloodthirstiness among the American sheep raisers. But it costs $1.04 to ship a sheep to market; and the sheep when it is sold for mutton brings the shipper just four cents less. There is, moreover, a law in Oregon forbidding sheep raisers deliberately to let their animals starve to death. The result is that the ewes die, but by their owner's hand. The Winebergs and the slain ewes! Between them there is a gulf that democracy has not yet found a bridge to cross. But even to a Drifter who knows nothing of economics it would seem that the bridge was desperately needed.

THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

What's Ahead?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Driven from our farm in 1924 by our inability to meet interest and tax payments, we have finally arrived at a point where there is nothing that even looks like a job ahead. Our home is now a tar-paper shack—one room fourteen by twenty-four, one layer of boards for sides and roof, covered with tar paper. This is our shelter from the elements.

We have been following the logging camps around, but this winter all camps are closed, and the word goes out that not a wheel will turn again unless the price of lumber goes up.

We thought we could not renew our subscription to *The Nation*, but have decided that the sooner we all go flat-broke and ask for help, the sooner this damnable system will crash. When we read of children starving, and of Mrs. So-and-So's jewels, valued at thousands of dollars, being stolen, we naturally wonder "how we got that way." If *The Nation* can tell us how to change such conditions, as individuals or as a group, we will gladly go without what the five dollars would buy.

Sandpoint, Idaho, January 14 NELLIE M. HUNTER

Mr. Anderson Makes a Correction

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In a letter to *The Nation* of January 20 Mrs. Cornelia Pinchot, Governor Pinchot's wife, complains that I misquoted her, misinterpreted her position, and put words in her mouth. She denies that her formal statement announcing her candidacy against Representative Louis McFadden stated that she based her decision to run on the ground that "he insulted our President." The slightest examination of my story will show that I did not quote her at all, and that I did not mention her formal statement. I quoted a common patrioteer's catch phrase to convey my opinion of her demagogic declaration that "anyone must resent an unsubstantiated attack of treason against the President." Apparently she feels that more weight should be ascribed to her written than to her oral utterances. I had assumed she would be equally responsible in both instances; and if she has any knowledge of popular psychology she must have known her oral statement would attract more public attention. If the purpose of it was not to capitalize pro-Hoover sentiment against McFadden, what was the purpose? Careless observation, reckless statement, and twisted argument are not qualified to recommend anyone for high office.

Washington, January 25 PAUL Y. ANDERSON

Russian Jobs Wanted

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Because of our great interest in the development of civilization, we, who are graduating from Oberlin College in June, petition *Nation* readers who have had contacts with Russia for any information concerning the possibility of getting jobs, positions, or anything there which would provide a sustenance and the chance to find out what is going on in the country. We would be willing to try anything where it would be possible to observe the communistic system in operation.

Oberlin, Ohio, January 20 VINCENT BUCHER
ROSCOE BLOSS

For San Francisco Readers

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The *Nation* Club of San Francisco and the Bay region will hold its annual dinner meeting on February 12, at the Liberal Arts Auditorium, 960 Bush Street, San Francisco. Harry Laidler, of the League for Industrial Democracy, Professor Robert O. Brady, of the University of California, and Lillian Symes will speak. Herbert L. Coggins will be chairman. The price of the dinner is $1. It is open to the public. Reservations may be made by getting in touch with me at 775 Guerrero Street; telephone, Valencia 1984.

San Francisco, January 28 SOPHIE GREENBERG

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Finance

The Real Credit Problem

MR. OGDEN MILLS, Undersecretary of the Treasury, in a recent address in New York, urged bankers to be more liberal and courageous in making loans, less insistent upon keeping their assets "liquid." Why are bankers reluctant to extend credit? Because they fear they will not be repaid. And what reason have they for that fear? They dread a further fall in the prices of commodities and securities which would undermine collateral values and impair customers' ability to pay. Hence the emphasis placed by Mr. Mills and other Administration spokesmen upon the assertion that deflation has gone too far and that it must be arrested. The government is about to throw hundreds of millions into the effort to arrest it, by providing loans to banks and railroads. With this support behind them, the banks in turn are asked to relax their clutch on cash and allow borrowers to have some of it.

This is an appeal to reason for which a case can be made out, however much one may dislike seeing government credit put to such uses. But so much cannot be said of that other part of the program which has to do with liberalizing the rediscount provisions of the Federal Reserve law to permit loans against securities. The danger of such changes does not lie in any immediate prospect of inflation, for it seems a safe enough prediction that no deliberate efforts to inflate at this time would be likely to succeed. It is not inflation we have to fear now, but the throwing open of the central banks to stock gamblers and real-estate speculators a decade hence, when our next boom gets under way.

Underlying most of the proposals for dipping into the Reserve banks is the hoary fallacy that "more dollars in circulation" is what is needed, and that these dollars are withheld because credit is scarce. There is no scarcity of credit in the United States today, any more than there is a scarcity of wheat or copper. The Governor of the New York Federal Reserve Bank recently pointed out that the Reserve system could lend its members three and a half billion dollars, on which, as reserve, those members could in turn create credit to the amount of thirty-five billions. The real scarcity is one of acceptable collateral, or credit risks which the banks recognize as good.

What these proposals for vast credit expansion actually contemplate is a change in the standard of credit, to the end that would-be borrowers who are now unable to obtain accommodation, because lenders fear repayment will not be made, may obtain the funds they want and need. Funds are needed, moreover, not for the immediate launching of new enterprises or expansion of old ones, but to pay off pressing obligations already incurred. Given time and a revival of business, these obligations may be paid, but in the meanwhile one can understand the reluctance of banks, which must pay their depositors on demand, to make loans against them.

Suggestions for ending the depression through large credit or currency expansion rest for the most part on the tacit assumption that depression has a primary cause, which can and must be removed. In a century of hard thinking, competent students have failed to isolate this cause. The late Senator Burton, in his book on business crises, quotes a list of alleged explanations ranging from gold scarcity to the tobacco habit and the issuance of free railroad passes. Alfred Marshall regarded the elements of an economic problem not as a chain of causation, "but as all mutually determining one another." Inflationists might well ponder that statement.

S. PALMER HARMAN

BONIBOOKS
$1.

AMERICAN OXFORD DICTIONARY
Compiled by F. G. and H. W. Fowler

EDUCATION AND THE GOOD LIFE
Bertrand Russell

GREAT SHORT STORIES OF THE WORLD
Edited by Barrett H. Clark and Maxim Lieber

OXFORD BOOK OF AMERICAN VERSE
Edited by Bliss Carman

ISRAEL
Ludwig Lewisohn

AGAINST THE GRAIN
J. K. Huysmans

OUR BUSINESS CIVILIZATION
James Truslow Adams

THE HIGH PLACE
James Branch Cabell

THIS EARTH OF OURS
Jean-Henri Fabre

WHAT IS WRONG WITH MARRIAGE
Hamilton & MacGowan

SOUTH WIND
Norman Douglas

MICHELANGELO
Romain Rolland

THE HISTORY OF MR. POLLY
H. G. Wells

TAR
Sherwood Anderson

ALBERT & CHARLES BONI NEW YORK

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books, Art, Drama

Winter: 1932

By JAMES RORTY

Over the dead the ancient battle rages:
Frost and warm earth; where the grave-digger has been,
December strikes
A myriad ice swords, perfect-frail, but piercing
Not far: already the brittle points
Soften and break; the grave-chant warming upward
Yields but a little; worm-hum and beetle,
Music invincible, six feet under.
Perfect their sleep, implacable; winter but feeds
The hot core, the drumming armies; in spring the dead
Storm in their graves, they will not forgive.

Two winters, and now a third; soon you must choose,
America, foolish virgin, incapable of love.
Fear death? Through this gate you must pass.
Fear death? In Massachusetts
Two died, in Russia two million; now the sickle wind
Swings from the north, yells death, more death.
Two winters, and now a third, there is much to slay.
Ah, pale cheat, soft liar, will nothing woo you?
Not words, nor wisdom, nor all time's contempt? Must
you wait
For the mob's leer, the mob's hot rape? . . . Soon you must
choose.

A soft land, hardening; a cold land, burning
Deep at the core. Already the gods have spoken:
"Not for us this child's farce, this idiot huddle of gold-
eaters, paper-eaters, god-eaters.
"What, you will share? You, who have naught to give—
"Courage, nor passion, nor the mind's hot seed? Yes, you
will share
"Terror, and cold, a mouthful of wind at your world's end."

Two winters, and now a third; the grave-chant rises, in
spring the dead
Storm in their graves; bar the door, America, snivel and lie:
Soon you must choose; you shall have lovers, time's womb
shall yet be served.

Jean-Jacques

Jean Jacques Rousseau. By Matthew Josephson. Harcourt, Brace and Company. $5.

WHEN the eighteenth century talked about Rousseau it was very likely to refer to him as Jean-Jacques, but it is, on the contrary, Rousseauism alone which figures very largely in contemporary discussions. The fact is not without its special significance, for it means that a personality has become an abstraction, and the chief merit of Mr. Josephson's painstaking study is, perhaps, that it reminds one again how foolish we are when we talk about him as though he were a disembodied spirit who had come from nowhere for the express purpose of making Mr. Irving Babbitt possible.

Relatively few of the present volume's 550 closely printed pages are devoted to abstract discussion, for most of them are concerned with the sayings and doings, or the comings and goings, of a rather fantastic but irresistibly arresting man, who—both literally and metaphorically—came and went in all directions as unceasingly as any human being ever possessed restlessness enough to do. Being a chronicle rather crowded, despite its considerable length, Mr. Josephson's book is not particularly easy to read, but it is crammed with information, and it has the effect of reorienting one's interest as it should be reoriented—of reminding one again that Rousseau was a historical phenomenon that is most profitably to be regarded as such. Doubtless his influence still exists, and in so far as it does it is discussible as such, but the origins and the references of his specific doctrines are so much a part of a remote age that it is ridiculous to discuss his errors gravely, as though, for example, the fantastic anthropology embodied in his conception of the state of primitive man had anything to do with deciding whether we today ought or ought not to seek to eradicate all our native impulses as completely as possible. Even a humanist should be able to realize that Rousseau's mythology has as little to do with the question as the mythology of the Old Testament has to do with that Protestant Christian attitude which the said humanist is so busy defending.

Of course Jean-Jacques was inconsistent and absurd as well as totally wrong in those a priori conclusions concerning the nature of primitive society which he shared with most learned men of his time. Of course it was inconsistent for a prophet of education to abandon his children to the particularly untender mercies of an eighteenth-century foundling asylum and of course many of his abstract ideas were, logically, as inconsistent as his actions. Memories of Plutarch's conception of "Roman virtue" had as much to do with his deification of "simplicity" as did any of his communions with nature, and the fact probably accounts for that failure to distinguish between personal and political freedom which made it possible for him to idealize the rigid institutions of Geneva while remaining in all his tastes essentially an anarchist. For him "nature" somehow included Italian opera as well as the fields and mountains and it was not by logic but by temperament that all he stood for was made a whole. He was a product of, as much as he was an influence on, his times, and he may actually have invented very little of that prodigious complex of rebellious doctrines and attitudes for which he stood. But he had the picturesqueness and the eloquence necessary to give them adequate expression. He was the object around which they crystallized.

To that extent, of course, it is legitimate to use him as a symbol, but it is a little late to attack him as an individual, and it is absurd to suppose that to annihilate him would be to diminish what is called his influence. Rousseauism—if one insists upon retaining the name—is by now detached from Rousseau and whatever his personal importance may once have been, it is not because of anything which can now be discovered in his books that the world persists in believing all sorts of things highly offensive to those who distrust human nature. To wipe out Rousseauism the whole of the eighteenth century at least would have to be wiped out, since the eighteenth century was despite the fact that this seems sometimes forgotten, the age of enthusiasm as well as the age of reason, and Rousseau and Richardson were quite as characteristic of it as Fielding and Voltaire. All its speculations and all its emotions are something which the Western world went through, and the experience produced effects upon its spirit which no series of polemics could eradicate, even if it were desirable that it should do so.

It happens that we are just now in one of those recurrent periods when those who are concerned with ideas feel above all else the need to set in order those which we already have. Overwhelmed with facts as well as theories, we long for order, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as a result it is not unnatural that dilettantes, especially, should profess a sort of precious admiration for whatever writers of the past are simple and consistent and clear. They admire certain very limited men for the reason that they are asking, not how rich their stock of ideas was, but how well it was ordered, and hence they are in no frame of mind to admire a man like Rousseau whose works are a chaos. Yet it should require only a very little historical-mindedness to realize that there are times when the stock of ideas does need to be renewed, and that it is at such times that the Rousseaus, scattering all sorts of seeds in all sorts of places, perform their indispensable function. And what is true of Rousseau is true of the enthusiastic, extravagant, and sentimental side of the eighteenth century. Comparatively little of all the literature which it produced is readable today. Everything it had to say was so new, so undisciplined, and so extravagant that it seems absurd. But every generation since has been concerned with the effort to explore and discipline the ideas and the sentiments which it introduced. Every such period enlarges somewhere the limits within which the spirit moves, and adds something to that repertory of possible ideas, emotions, and sensitivities which makes the experience of being human what it is. Even an unromantic age can no more escape the influence of the fact that it has inherited something from romanticism than a skeptical age can escape the fact that it has inherited something from Christianity. No matter how hard we try not to be, every one of us is, to some extent, both a Rousseauist and a Christian.

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

"Individualism" and Housing

Recent Trends in American Housing. By Edith Elmer Wood. The Macmillan Company. $3.

THE simple fact about American housing is stated on page 46 of Mrs. Wood's excellent book. "Two-thirds of the population cannot pay a rental or purchase price high enough to produce a commercial profit on a new dwelling." A new dwelling, that is, which complies with minimum standards of light, air, space, and sanitation.

One-third of American families have incomes under $1,200 a year, one-third have incomes between $1,200 and $2,000, and one-third have incomes over $2,000. Yet, as Mr. Robert Whitten showed in his recent study, there are practically no houses of any sort being built in this country to sell under $4,500—and the $4,500 house is likely to be a makeshift extravagance at any price. This means that the people who live in wedged-in wood-and-paper packing boxes in Queens, in the newer of the dismal brick rows in Philadelphia, and in the more-gadgeted dark flats in the Bronx must belong to the fortunate richest third of our population—or skimp on food and clothing to pay for their superior homes. And the others—where do they live? In New York City about two million of them are still crowded in old-law tenements, which it has been illegal to build for thirty years.

Mrs. Wood shows that higher wages alone—the only thing for which workers themselves have actively campaigned—will never radically change the prohibitive ratio between income and the cost of a house. She shows that building-and-loan associations, while they give mild aid in the construction of something under 150,000 homes a year, never reach below the middle of the top income group. She shows that limited-dividend enterprise alone, while it may materially reduce costs, can never reach the lowest third, and, owing to its undependable private philanthropic nature, will never be more than a dubious drop in the bucket anyway. She shows that tax exemption, subsidy though it is, can never produce effective results without a corollary system of State or municipal credits, the only realistic solution.

Had her book not been published just a little too soon for such comment, she would undoubtedly have shown with equally acid clarity that the President's little mortgage-discount idea, while it might help the banks to cash in on some of their already existing paper, has less than nothing to do with the future construction of houses. And that the President's Conference on Home Ownership and Home Building was not, with the exception of the Committee on Large-Scale Housing, really concerned with houses at all. (It would be so nice, and so *American,* they yearned wistfully, if every family could go out and buy a delightful piece of ground and build thereon the individual home of its dreams and incidentally become a conservative property-owner. Home ownership vaguely connotes stability, and the misplaced emphasis on a comparatively unimportant *effect* is merely a typical case of governmental frustration and romantic wish-fulfilment. Actually, buying a house when you are always in danger of losing your job or being moved somewhere else contributes about as much toward safety and stability as buying stock on margin without having additional resources.)

The point is well clinched by a summary of actual achievements in the construction of working-class dwellings in the United States since the war. The list, which includes the work of cooperative societies, limited-dividend companies, private philanthropists, and public authorities, is as follows:

New York City: Under 10,000 apartments (private funds for the most part under State Housing Board control);

California: 7,500 houses (under the Veterans' Farm and Home Purchase Act);

Chicago: 1,000 apartments (private funds, philanthropic);

Rest of country: 1,000 dwellings.

This makes a grand total of under 20,000 dwellings, more than half of which are too expensive for any but the highest income group. For obvious reasons, the deplorable results of the earlier unregulated tax-exemption experiment in New York are not included.

Meanwhile, in England, Germany, and Holland about 3,000,000 working-class homes have been built since the war. Many miles of slums have been cleared—something which has not even been started in America. And the negative subsidy of unrestricted tax exemption "has cost the New York taxpayers a great deal more than London has paid for her 'assisted' working-class housing." But we are, again in Mrs. Wood's words, "still thanking God that we are not as other men are and that we do not interfere with the sacred laws of supply and demand in the matter of providing homes for those who need them."

C. K. BAUER

Italian Literature

History of Italian Literature. By Francesco de Sanctis. Translated by Joan Redfern. With an Introduction by Benedetto Croce. Harcourt, Brace and Company. Two volumes. $7.50.

THAT a book can be understood and estimated more accurately when the reader brings to it a knowledge of the age which produced it has become so accepted a truism that its more extreme upholders feel that they must use it not as a conclusion but as a point of departure. It has led, as a result, to some unbalanced critical judgments and ideas. Some of our sociological critics, ignoring their book, have lost themselves, and their readers, in the background; others, disapproving of the social or economic character of a period, have indicted its writers with almost as little reasonableness as a traveler would show if he despised the inhabitants of a foreign country for its evil climate.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Literary criticism that seeks to evaluate a book within its setting and influences requires a genius to whom this double seeing would be not a program but a natural act, the result of an almost intuitive power. And as he saw the two together, a unity, so would he write of them, and not as theoretical critics do, laboriously, first a chapter of one, then of the other. Such criticism calls also for one who is a very fine writer himself, so that he may speak of other writers—without self-consciousness, of course—as their peer, and as one who has shared their experiences.

De Sanctis is such a genius. His method, being natural to him, requires no long preface of analysis and justification. When he opens in the beginnings of Italian literature, we are at once in the midst of men, events, ideas, books. Their interpenetration is as complete and active as the fused matter in our minds; and it is achieved not by any breathless mannerism of style but by the spontaneity and whole-heartedness of De Sanctis's interest in his subject, which takes him deeper than his scholarship alone would have enabled him to go. He is so thoroughly interested, so actively concerned, that his emotions are fluent, and their movement communicates directly to the reader happiness, pride, anger, scorn, awe, or sadness, in the same sequence as the men and events that cause them.

About a book like this there is actually little to say except that it is admirable and almost unique in critical literature, and that it would be well for us if every other great national literature had a De Sanctis for its historian. The book has some defects and shortcomings, of course. Being a collection of lectures, it has the lecture's necessary evil of excessive repetition. It was gathered hastily, some parts are less careful than others, and some magnificent metaphors are crudely finished or undone by a mixture. Above all, as an intellectual fruit of the Risorgimento, it gives too much weight to patriotism, and explains too many possibly racial insufficiencies by national disunity. The author's patriotism, however, is in no sense factitious or extraneous, but has become an organic part of his outlook. And his native vision was too clear, and he was too much the artist, for him to allow it to spoil his book.

ISIDOR SCHNEIDER

Death of an Empire

The Birth of the German Republic. 1871-1918. By Arthur Rosenberg. Translated from the German by Ian F. D. Morrow. Oxford University Press. $4.75.

THE nature and contents of this book would be more nearly expressed by calling it "The Death of the German Empire," for it begins with an analysis of the social forces under Bismarck in 1871 and ends with November 10, 1918—just before the Weimar Assembly drafted the new constitution. The period covered, however, receives a thorough treatment, and the author has done his work in a fine spirit of critical detachment. The internal political conflicts under William II, the World War and the *Burgfriede,* the dictatorship under Ludendorff, the peace resolutions of 1917, Ludendorff at the zenith of his power, and the final collapse—these are the main topics which form the outline of the book; but the wide gulf between Kaiser, chancellors, and military leaders, on the one hand, and the numerous political parties representing the masses, on the other, forms the background of the tragic story of a system which received its death blow on the battlefield of the Marne, and the passing of which ended an epoch in German history.

Dr. Rosenberg was admirably qualified for this work, for he was a member of the Reichstag Committee of Inquiry into the causes of Germany's collapse and therefore in a position seldom accorded to the historian for getting material at first hand. He belonged to no party or organization, and he had an opportunity for hearing from the leading soldiers and politicians their own explanations of the downfall of the empire. The failure to weather the storm without, according to the author, has its chief explanation in the old constitution, which ignored popular opinion and placed the control of government in the hands of the Emperor and incompetent leaders. Prussia, which controlled the empire, had a class government supported by the army, and when this class, which included the nobility and leading army officials, was destroyed in the first year of the war, there was no party trained to formulate a new policy. When the old army, which numbered some three-quarters of a million men, was replaced in 1916 with four million recruits composed of the divergent political tendencies of the nation, the new officers, though by no means democratic, felt themselves the political leaders of society, and looked to Hindenburg and Ludendorff rather than to William II and the Crown Prince to rescue Germany; but this merely led to the dictatorship, which, failing in the end, left Germany bleeding and torn, with no guiding principles. The result was the Versailles treaty.

While the criticism of the Bismarckian constitution which runs through the narrative may perhaps be just, one may still question whether any other form of government in Germany at the time would have succeeded better. Our system, too, placed the conduct of the war in the hands of one man, the President, limited, to be sure, by the Senate. In a crisis it is not only politics but democracy itself that is adjourned.

KARL F. GEISER

International Drama

The International Note in Contemporary Drama. By Evelyn Newman. New York: Kingsland Press.

THIS is a very serious attempt to follow the growth of international accord from one angle only: that of an increasingly passionate belief in and desire for universal peace. In that respect Dr. Newman's thesis is an international note, clearly seen in the plays of England, France, and Germany —incidentally of America—from pre-war to post-war days. There is, of course, a larger vision of internationalism, of which this is only a part. Theatergoers are fast becoming international-minded. A season demands a familiarity with the stages of all countries. Eugene O'Neill's "Desire Under the Elms" and "Emperor Jones" are as familiar in France and Germany and Czecho-Slovakia as are "R. U. R.," by Capek, "From Morn to Midnight," by Kaiser, "The Unknown Warrior," by Raynal, and "Masse Mensch," by Toller, to Broadway.

Dr. Newman assembles all those plays of the chief belligerent countries in the Great War that have to do with the general theme of war and the specific hope for economic and social adjustment in the future. She shows clearly how the different avenues of approach center in an intense condemnation of the old idea of the glories of war, no matter what country the dramatist hails from. It is evident from the findings that the writer for the theater, even though he might give us a British "Journey's End" or an American "What Price Glory?" has taken war from the battlefield and has placed its strain in the inner being of man himself; and it is man who is being sapped and shattered and disillusioned by the old concepts of bravery and honor and loyalty.

In other words, says Dr. Newman, "literature has broken from war," and she proceeds, in the five chapters of her thesis, to assemble the facts in favor of her arguments. If you have seen "Merchants of Glory," by Pagnol, you have witnessed what can be done with glory which is exploited for political prefer-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment. If you have seen "Wings Over Europe," by Nichols and Browne, you have sensed how the ideals of peace and the instruments to assure peace are valued by the powers in office, and how cabinets abhor ideals unless they offer practical outlets for the increase of national power. The realism of the dramas written directly about war on the battlefield gives way before the philosophical approach in the post-war years, where despair, such as one detects in "Hoppla, Wir Leben!" by Toller, is uppermost. There is an international distrust of the machine age, there is an international fear of the next war, and these are the themes recurrent in the new international drama. Dr. Newman reviews over 125 plays; she painfully outlines their essential plots: that is the dispiriting part of an otherwise interesting theme, for no synopsis can do justice to the shadings of a play. She shows us what we felt when Granville Barker produced Euripides's "The Trojan Women" in our college stadia, that even the ancients were propagandists for peace. Though the contemporary dramatists veil their fervor behind a cloak of past history, historical characters stand reinterpreted as champions of humanitarian ideals. Georg Kaiser, Fritz von Unruh, Alfred Neumann, Ernst Toller have thus used history. Rolland and Shaw, O'Casey and O'Neill have also in their way pleaded for a higher social spirit which is as necessary for conquest of war as the scrapping of armament. No matter to what country you turn for drama, you find some concept of what peace should mean, and how it should be gained.

It would never do to read this book carefully for its literary value; but it does bring you this unity of desire, which certainly is one manifestation of the international note in the contemporary theater.

MONTROSE J. MOSES

Book of the Cloud

The Flowering Stone. By George Dillon. The Viking Press. $1.75.

IN the symbolic vocabulary of Blake George Dillon's first volume of poems, "Boy in the Wind," might have been called his Book of the Lily (innocence, wonder); "The Flowering Stone" is his Book of the Cloud. It represents that interval, described with such humble savagery by Keats in his preface to "Endymion," when the poet wanders between the imaginations of boyhood and maturity, afflicted by the perturbations of his senses and the ferment in his soul. An indigestion of new influences and the sterile idolatry of an abstract Beauty are characteristic of this hiatus. A little earlier and a little later both taste and genius are more dependable. Mr. Dillon is intrinsically too good a poet to conclude one of his most interesting conceptions with a sympathetic evocation

> Of ladies and their lovers mouth to mouth
> Deep in the south.

September Noon, however, is not his only poem to suffer from a sudden aberration of judgment. The failures in this volume include The Wakening, The Charm, Extemporary Lines, Elegy, Soliloquy Along a Sidewalk, Woman Without Fear. But "failures" is too strong a word: Mr. Dillon is incapable of writing a wholly bad poem.

The best poem in "The Flowering Stone" and in many respects the most remarkable he has yet given us is the untitled sixth piece in the section called Anatomy of Death. To give a hint of its value I must ruthlessly tear a few lines from their context:

> Here on a spoiling planet everywhere
> Life starts from its tireless cisterns, strange, renewed,
> In lovers' bodies. It is by no means subdued.
> It seethes from its coldness, a quarrel of ice in the sun . . .

It is an elaborate conceit; beautifully sustained through its mazes of meaning, fierce, incisive, startling, and cruel. Unlike Mr. Dillon's other poems of moderate length (e. g., the fourth poem of the same section), it presents itself as a unit, instead of jerking forward—and sometimes backward—line by line at the caprice of the rhymes.

I like, too, The Mad Hunter; The Summery Night; Before the Frost; Mind Without Substance, Bright and Shadowy; What Artifice; Fantasia of Winter; and Autumn Movement. The ten sonnets that comprise An Address to the Doomed are marked by a quiet strength and dignity of utterance, but the set form brings with it a host of stale conventions, traditional themes, and time-honored postures, which Mr. Dillon adeptly recapitulates without quite achieving a fresh statement. I feel that the outline of his personality as a poet is yet to be clearly drawn. There is no bold demarcation between his ego and the climate of life; although, until these boundaries are unequivocally established, the structure of personality must be at best an illusion, like the shape of a cloud.

In general these are poems of mood rather than of conflict. They are more sensitive than intense. This poet (*mirabile dictu!*) believes in the beneficence of earth. Three of his worst lines exhort us to

> Go laughing, though. Go loving, though.
> Go hounding beauty always. Oh,
> Endure the dazzling dream unblurred,

In his cosmology both man and God are "dreamer[s] in a dream"; "life is proud and long"; "Beauty cannot die"; the eternal dualities are merely a "childish pair," whose divorce the happy man will have "patched up"; the purpose of death is "to fashion a more marvelous thing." This is a comforting faith which we should all like to share, but I am not persuaded that Mr. Dillon's reconciliations are either inherent in his temperament or the inspired optimism of a whole vision. It is significant that in the present collection the finest poems, containing the germ of a more curious metaphysics, poke at a body of evil that is not lightly to be dreamed away.

The stages of a poet's progress are not equally profitable. Some may find "The Flowering Stone" disappointing after "Boy in the Wind," if only because the character of the poetry has altered. A real cause for disappointment would have been the repetition in this second volume of the charming perfections of the first. The poetry in a man is organic: it is subject, typically, to diseases peculiar to each period of its growth. There is ample evidence in "The Flowering Stone" that George Dillon's is a ripening art.

STANLEY J. KUNITZ

Books in Brief

The Imperial Theme. Further Interpretations of Shakespeare's Tragedies, Including the Roman Plays. By G. Wilson Knight. Oxford University Press. $4.50.

Mr. Knight, whose previous books, "Myth and Miracle" and "The Wheel of Fire," have done as much as anything else to direct the trend of current Shakespearean criticism toward a consideration of the literary aspects of the plays as distinguished from the historical and the bibliographical, carries on in this volume with essays about "Julius Caesar," "Hamlet," "Macbeth," "Coriolanus," and "Antony and Cleopatra." He has not abandoned his resolve to find in Shakespeare evidences of an occupation with "life-themes"—honor, order, and love—and "death-themes"—hatred, disease, disorder, and death. Indeed, in the concluding chapters he brings his exposition to a climax when he demonstrates that "Antony and Cleopatra" is Shakespeare's best play because it holds all of these themes in a whole-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some balance—love, however, triumphing. There is danger in a critical theory which decides for one play as against another because its "values" are "positive"; and Mr. Knight is not without excesses and absurdities. Nevertheless he is a very brilliant commentator. In no one else at present is there anything like his passion for Shakespeare; and no one else has his ability to discover new excellences. If only a tenth of the virtues he finds in his hero were actually there—and perhaps nine-tenths of them are there—we could understand how it is that Shakespeare rises head and shoulders above all other poets and playwrights. Mr. Knight is absolutely saturated with the plays. He lives with their images, he suffers with their persons, he breathes their poetry. And he is well on the way toward an estimate of Shakespeare the artist which must stand somewhere in the neighborhood of final things.

A Naturalist in Brazil. By Konrad Guenther. Translated by Bernard Miall. Houghton Mifflin Company. $5.

Dr. Guenther has what is rare in a naturalist, a genuine love of nature. It gives a gusto to his work that makes his book extremely readable in spite of occasional effusiveness and sentimentality. His chapters on the social insects present no new material, but the presentation is keen and dramatic. The chapter on the tropical forest, however, is invaluable, and makes as visible as words can make it the difference between forests in the equator and those in temperate zones. The chapter on Nature as an Organism is packed with interesting information, and is itself constructed upon an organic concept.

Fortune's Favorites: Portraits of Some American Corporations. An Anthology from *Fortune* Magazine. Alfred A. Knopf. $5.

Since the war, which created an astonishing number of millionaires in America, there has been a decided appetite among our business men for dignity. The magazine *Fortune* was organized to meet this demand—as well as the standing American demand for the "inside story." The present volume contains, supposedly, the inside stories of fifteen of our largest corporations: American Telephone and Telegraph Company, Swift and Company, Aluminum Company of America, Drug, Inc., American Can Company, A. O. Smith Corporation, Great Atlantic and Pacific Tea Company, International Telephone and Telegraph Company, R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Company, Allied Chemical and Dye Corporation, Standard Oil Company of New York, New York Times Company, Bausch and Lomb Optical Company, Niagara-Hudson Power Corporation, Coca-Cola Company. One article is signed by Stuart Chase; the rest are anonymous. The style is consciously tony; next to sales data we are apt to find an allusion to the classics. The innocence of these anonymous authors concerning the true forces at work in the building of large corporations is beautiful. No millionaire's six-year-old daughter could be more certain of her daddy's benevolence. Such ignorance is necessary of course, for the purpose of the articles is plainly eulogistic; they are simply a new kind of market letter.

De Maisse. A Journal of All That Was Accomplished by Monsieur de Maisse Ambassador in England from King Henry IV to Queen Elizabeth, Anno Domini 1597. Translated from the French and Edited with an Introduction by G. B. Harrison and R. A. Jones. Random House. $2.50.

This is the first edition in English—incidentally, there is no edition in French—of a journal which has been much quoted by historians and by biographers of Elizabeth. De Maisse, sent by Henry IV to find what was in Elizabeth's mind concerning a possible peace with Spain, was baffled, as most men were, in his attempt to read that mind. But he left one of the most intimate accounts we have of the queen's character and appearance—particularly her appearance, which in these handsome pages may henceforth be viewed for the astonishing thing it was.

Infants of the Spring. By Wallace Thurman. The Macaulay Company. $2.

In his first novel, "The Blacker the Berry . . .," Mr. Thurman gave a rather remarkable account of the struggles of a Negro girl whose problems arose not from white discrimination but from the prejudices of the lighter-skinned members of her own race. His new book is more ambitious. Describing the lives of several Negro artists and intellectuals, it necessarily concerns itself with various fundamental economic, racial, and philosophical problems. In narrating the events in which his characters take part Mr. Thurman often writes vividly, and even the long passages in which the characters talk over their problems show considerable insight; but the impression remains that the author is too close to these questions to make the discussion of them objective, and the resulting confusion is heightened by his attempt to deal with several more or less unrelated themes. The effect of all this is, naturally, to diffuse Mr. Thurman's powers and obscure his virtues.

Art

William Gropper

WHAT passes for pictorial satire in the average comic or political periodical in America is in most cases inferior academic drawing humorously captioned. Remove the caption, and the cartoons will serve with perfect appropriateness to advertise the soap that floats, the skin you love to touch, or the runless stocking. A notable exception is made by the small group of cartoonists and caricaturists in the radical movement—Young, Minor, Ellis, Gellert, Burck, Gropper, and a number of others who might be considered on the fringe—Soglow, Dehn, Covarrubias.

The current exhibition of William Gropper (John Reed Club) shows him to be a vitriolic critic of established society and a fine graphic artist as well—one who has developed a style fully adequate to his message. Here is, for example, Police Brutality, a subject treated countless times in the radical press; but notice how superior Gropper's drawing is to most by virtue of his better technical equipment—taking for granted his native gift. One of "New York's finest" with uplifted club is bearing down into the mob over a figure lying in his way. A few solid strokes of pitch-black ink serve to define the brute strength of the policeman's back; a mobile contour renders the forward motion of the horse under him; thinner lines used with the same economy suggest the less essential details. Areas of ink diluted to the consistency of a faint wash and distributed with excellent judgment bind the various parts into a cartoon of striking effectiveness.

The best work of Gropper exhibits a similar procedure, although his chief concern is not with "art" at all. No political cartoonist can be "above the battle." Gropper repudiates impartiality. He is quite avowedly committed to a cause which envisages contemporary society as the battleground of a relentless class war between capitalists and workers. Gropper employs his cartoons as a weapon in the class war, as a means of mobilizing the working masses for "the final conflict." Therefore an inventory of his themes is simply a wholesale, withering arraignment of the evils of the system he detests: the sleek hypocrisy of the politician, the venal corruption of the judge,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ıe lawless terrorism of police and "gorillas," the bellicose ag-ressiveness of the imperialist, the pharisaic unctuousness of riest and rabbi, the smug complacency of the philanthropist, ıe open racketeering of labor lieutenants, the callous inhumanıy of boss and landlord. Each of the artist's strictures is simıe, laconic, bare of all superfluities; each is embodied in a living pe both concrete and symbolic, easily recognizable—and preachg a sermon more eloquent than a dozen editorials.

The revolutionary cartoonist has a twofold aim: to hearten ıd encourage those already in the revolutionary ranks, and to in new recruits into those ranks. Lincoln considered Thomas last a "recruiting sergeant" for the Union! Gropper is a reruiting sergeant in a much greater civil war—a civil war inolving all mankind. As previously noted, however, the signifiınce of Gropper's work is not exhausted by its illustrative value lone, by the ideological weight of its statements. To avoid ıonotony and add force to his statements Gropper constantly xperiments with papers gray and white, thick and thin, rough ıd smooth, with wet and dry brush, black and diluted ink, ıatter, dots, dashes, crayon, new compositional schemes—with ıe result that his best cartoons carry power, vitality, and conıiction which a mere recording of actual events could never chieve. Daumier, to stress the contemporary character of his ork, said, "Je suis de mon temps"; Gropper and all other rtists enlisted in the same cause revise Daumier's statement to ead, "Je suis de ma classe," making it clear that *la classe uvrière* is meant.

LOUIS LOZOWICK

Drama

"Worse than Death"

SEVEN years ago one of the experimental theaters brought forth a play by a certain Dan Totheroh called "Wild Birds." It told the story of two young lovers in the West who fled from cruel parents only to die like babes in the woods, ınd it was rather widely praised for a kind of naive charm which persisted despite a pervading, slightly infantile, absurdity. Nothing further was heard of the author in New York until he appearance of "Distant Drums," which has just been proluced at the Belasco and which, unfortunately, is only slightly nore substantial than the former offering.

This time the play is concerned with the adventures of a group of pioneers en route for Oregon in a train of prairie schooners. All the scenes take place in the semicircular encampment formed by the wagons, and the chief character is a mysterious woman of vaguely poetical temperament who does not know what she came for until it is discovered that she is the price demanded by an Indian chief for the information which will enable the pioneers to find their way out of the mountains. After some debate, she goes shudderingly to him and the play is over.

Profoundly ignorant as I am concerning the habits of Indians, I really do not know whether or not they had any interest in white women except as possible victims of scalping, and it may be that they did have; but the point is simply that the present play does not make me ready to believe the fact. The central incident remains improbable and appears wholly factitious—something invented for the purpose of supplying the necessary plot by an author who started out with a desire to write about the pioneers, but whose genuine imagination never carried him farther than the general atmosphere of such an expedition as that which he presents. This atmosphere, indeed, is not ineffectively created. One believes in the minor characters, one believes in the reality of the romantic caravan, and one is

Speaking of the Cost of Good Books

THOMAS MANN'S
THE MAGIC MOUNTAIN
Complete and Unabridged
in one volume in the
MODERN LIBRARY
EDITION AT
95 CENTS A COPY

In Germany, traditional land of inexpensive books, the cheapest edition of "The Magic Mountain" is 10 marks ($2.38). In England it is published in two volumes at 18 shillings (about $3.06). This is only one of a number of Modern Library books cheaper than any other edition in existence.

Other Modern Library High Lights

CRIME AND PUNISHMENT DOSTOYEVSKY
OF HUMAN BONDAGE . . MAUGHAM
TONO BUNGAY . . . . H. G. WELLS
DROLL STORIES . . . . . BALZAC

A five dollar bill brings you
all five of these books!
At all booksellers. Send for list of titles

THE MODERN LIBRARY, INC., 20 East 57th Street, New York

NEXT WEEK IN THE NATION

Close-up of Washington

an article by

William E. Woodward

Author of "George Washington—The Image and the Man."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOCIAL FORCES IN SOCIAL WORK

The trained social worker regards the individual, family and community he serves as centers of convergence of racial, religious, economic and other social forces which hark back to the past and must be utilized to fashion the future. This view is especially important if the worker's field lies in such a highly distinctive group as the Jews.

College graduates should examine carefully the advantages, both tangible and intangible, of

Jewish Social Work as a Profession

A number of scholarships and fellowships ranging from $150 to $1000 for each academic year are available for especially qualified candidates.

For full information write to

M. J. KARPF, *Director*

The Training School For Jewish Social Work

(a graduate school)

71 W. 47th St., New York City

Soviet Russia Equals Europe . . . *in cost to the traveler*

For the summer of 1932 the Open Road is able to offer its standard travel services in Russia at European prices.

A month's round trip to the U. S. S. R. with expenses New York to Russia and return steamship passage from Europe can be made for . . . $238, third class on land and sea (with tourist class Baltic crossing and second class sleeper Helsingfors-Leningrad). $359, second class on land, tourist class at sea (first class Baltic crossing).

Itineraries may be drafted to suit. Experienced Open Road representatives in Leningrad and Moscow know how to make a little time go a long way in a country where the visitor plunges into a bewildering new civilization and where every waking hour of the sojourn is precious.

In writing for itineraries and rates, indicate what phases of Russian life interest you most and whether you prefer to travel with a group or independently.

The OPEN ROAD

Salmon Tower, 11 West 42nd Street, New York City

Cooperating in U. S. S. R. with INTOURIST

ready for the drama which the setting seems to promise. Bu the preparation is wasted and the big scene does not come off The distant drums are beating; terrible things are about t happen just off stage. And yet it is impossible to forget ever for a minute that this is a play. Instead of thinking abou Indians and the drama of the West, one finds oneself think ing about all the other lives "worse than death" to whicl so many other heroines of melodrama have been about to go Usually the villains are Chinamen, and one begins to doubt i this chief is really a chief at all. Perhaps he is the mysteriou Mr. Wu in disguise, for everybody knows that Mr. Wu woul be capable of even that trick.

The central character is played by Miss Pauline Lord— she of the vague gesture and infinitely pathetic helplessness— who lends to the character whatever credibility it has. To watch her in even an unsatisfactory play is to be touched in a very special way, for she has the power of being appealing quite independently of her lines or situations. Once I compared her to Charlie Chaplin, who seems always to be acting in a kind of continued story about himself, and the comparison will still hold. Even in "Distant Drums" she is the same bewildered and charming person whom one has been drawn to so often before, and we believe in her even when we do not believe in the incidents which she is enacting.

"Mr. Papavert" (Vanderbilt Theater) is an even less satisfactory play. Produced a few weeks ago and closed for revision after two performances, it remains crudely conceived, crudely acted, and, even in its central situation, rather less promising than tender-hearted reviewers professed to find it. Undoubtedly something might be made out of the tendency of radical groups to exploit for their own purposes those victims of injustice whom they undertake to defend. We have, as a matter of fact, a now-pending case in which something of the sort is alleged to have occurred. But the particular situation used in "Mr. Papavert" is distinctly unfortunate since it reminds one inevitably of Tom Mooney or Sacco and Vanzetti, no one of whom was, like the hero of the present play, out of sympathy with his champions.

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Contributors to This Issue

DAVID W. WAINHOUSE was formerly assistant director of research of the Council on Foreign Relations.

WINIFRED RAUSHENBUSH has for many years been engaged in sociological research in various fields.

ROMAIN ROLLAND, famous French author, is the outstanding literary exponent of pacifism.

MORRIS L. ERNST, a New York attorney, is the author of "America's Primer."

JAMES RORTY is the author of a book of poems, "Children of the Sun."

C. K. BAUER is executive secretary of the Regional Planning Association of America.

ISIDOR SCHNEIDER is the author of "The Temptation of Anthony."

KARL F. GEISER is professor of political science at Oberlin College.

MONTROSE J. MOSES is the author of "The Fabulous Forrest: The Record of an American Actor."

STANLEY J. KUNITZ is the author of a volume of poems, "Intellectual Things."

LOUIS LOZOWICK, painter and illustrator, is a contributing editor of the *New Masses*.

LINDSAY ROGERS is professor of public law at Columbia University.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

French Logic Versus Customs Unions

By LINDSAY ROGERS

EVEN though the Austro-German customs union has been relegated to the limbo of abandoned projects, it is still much discussed. There is little likelihood that the manner of its abandonment will be speedily forgotten. In formulating her policy toward Germany, France will frequently hark back to the method and substance of the attempted economic *Anschluss*. The advisory opinion of the Permanent Court will be cited when future customs unions are projected, and when such schemes for the Danubian area come to fruition, French logic will have a severe test.

That this may be the case was suggested by an article on the court's opinion which M. Jacques Bardoux published in the Paris *Temps* of October 1, 1931. The *Temps* is a semi-official journal. Its opinions, that is to say, are rarely opposed to the views held by the Quai d'Orsay. M. Bardoux is a distinguished and widely read publicist. His attitude is therefore of double interest. Moreover, M. Bardoux's reasoning has double implications, for not only does it relate to the decision of the Permanent Court, but it is an excellent illustration of the curious manner in which certain French publicists forget that the points which they make so neatly in behalf of France are really points which can be made against France.

M. Bardoux declares that the opinion of the Permanent Court was a "victory" for Sir Cecil Hurst, lately legal adviser to the British Foreign Office and now one of the judges at The Hague. The "victory" resulted from the fact that by a majority of one the court refused to accept the French thesis of incompatibility between the customs-union protocol of March, 1931, and Article 88 of the Treaty of St. Germain, which forbids Austria to compromise her independence. The court simply held that the customs union would be in violation of the protocol of 1922, under which Austrian finances were restored and Austrian economic independence was guaranteed against violation. Thus of two barriers to the conclusion of the customs agreement the court selected the one which was less important and more precarious. The issue, therefore, is not closed but may be reopened.

In obtaining this result Sir Cecil Hurst—the argument runs—achieved a great "political success." He isolated in a "weak and precarious majority" representatives of Latin thought on the court—France, Italy, Spain, Rumania, South America, and Poland, France's ally. On the other side were the representatives of England, the United States, Germany, and Holland. It was an "accident" that the Chinese and Japanese judges were in this group. The presence of the Belgian in such a coterie was a "warning"—a warning, doubtless, that Belgium may not follow France when she is convinced that the French position is incorrect. Here was a cleavage between the Latin and non-Latin conceptions of law. The latter, with its common-law background, closed the door without locking it. But why discuss the decision in terms of a triumph for Sir Cecil Hurst?

The fallacy of doing this is apparent if one thinks of the article of the same genre which could be written for an English or German newspaper. The French have a judge on the Permanent Court. He is M. Fromageot, lately legal adviser of the Quai d'Orsay but not specifically mentioned in M. Bardoux's article. The decision holding the customs union illegal under the 1922 protocol could be interpreted as showing how successful M. Fromageot had been in lining up the Latin judges and persuading them to accept his views. The Rumanian and Polish judges came from countries which are France's allies. The political success of the Quai d'Orsay in counting on their votes was assured from the beginning. Only in the case of Belgium was France unsuccessful in securing a natural adherent of the bloc. M. Fromageot was unable to convince the Belgian judge. He was unsuccessful in that only seven judges considered the customs union illegal under the Treaty of St. Germain, but he was successful in that eight judges considered the union illegal under the 1922 protocol. Such an analysis of the Permanent Court's opinion would be grossly unfair, but it is no more unfair than M. Bardoux's comments on the non-Latin bloc which, it is alleged, was built by Sir Cecil Hurst. To suggest this is not to defend the decision and its political basis. Nor is it to deny the truth in the jest that if the judges had been weighed instead of counted, the decision would have upheld the legality of the proposed customs union. My point is simply that M. Bardoux, experienced publicist though he be, thinks only in terms of France, so that he writes in blissful ignorance of the fact that his argument can be very neatly turned against him.

M. Bardoux, unfortunately, is not an isolated case. He assumes that the French position on the customs case was unchallengeable; that it was so right that the unwillingness to accept that position *in toto* discloses a conspiracy against France. If all states took such a rigid point of view no international negotiations would be possible. Because the French point of view did not triumph completely, the customs decision is considered a political success of Sir Cecil Hurst. Just as fairly or unfairly, the decision may be considered as a triumph of M. Fromageot. If each side argues in this fashion, what hope is there for intelligent discussion? Too many French publicists "reason" without seeing that precisely the same kind of "reasoning" can be used against France.

When, for example, reparations were being settled at The Hague, and Philip Snowden, Chancellor of the British Exchequer, announced that Great Britain would not make further sacrifices, he was denounced as willing to break up the conference. That was the tone of practically every article in the French press. There was little or no discussion of the merits or demerits of the British case. Would it not have been equally fair or unfair to say that France was willing to break up the conference because of her refusal to discuss England's refusal further to sacrifice? If that had been the tone of the non-French press, what would France have said? At The Hague it remained for Italy, whose diplomacy is rapidly becoming the most astute on the Conti-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUNGER AND LOVE

A Novel by Lionel Britton
Introduction by Bertrand Russell

is . . . . .

—no book for the faint-hearted;
—no book for the intellectually lazy;
—no book for those who wish to believe this the best of all possible worlds;
—no book for those who do not want to be stirred, aroused, angered, electrified, embittered.

Among those who have been extravagantly enthusiastic about this novel, which has created a sensation in England (it is now in its third printing there) are BERNARD SHAW, BERTRAND RUSSELL, ARNOLD BENNETT, LAURENCE STALLINGS and UPTON SINCLAIR. Originally published in this country by Harper and Brothers at $4, it is now reissued at $3 by its present publishers, who have acquired all American rights.

623 Pages $3 at all bookstores

THE VANGUARD PRESS 100 Fifth Ave., New York

YOU'LL want to read

Jessie Fauset's

powerful novel about *modern* Negroes—

***The* CHINABERRY TREE**

Countee Cullen says:
"It mightily establishes Miss Fauset's position as our foremost Negro fictionist." Author of "Plum Bun."

At your bookshop. $2.00

F. A. STOKES COMPANY, 443 Fourth Ave., New York

PROOF!

Oscar Ameringer's new journal of opinion, in seven months' time has shown the following growth:

April 3, 1931....3,618	Aug. 1, 1931....8,942
May 1, 1931.....5,012	Sept. 1, 1931....11,216
June 1, 1931....6,326	Oct. 1, 1931....15,829
July 1, 1931.....7,842	Nov. 1, 1931....18,027

Born during the worst period of the depression, without the use of a single premium, without the payment of one cent to subscription agents, The American Guardian has had such excellent growth.

Imagine a newspaper voicing the radical spirit of the day, receiving in its mails, subscriptions from bankers and day laborers, professional men and workers, letters from men and women in every walk of life, saying, "I like your humor, your wit, your logic, and I'll help you grow." Write for samples. Let the paper speak for itself.

$1.00 for the Year

THE AMERICAN GUARDIAN

BOX 777

Oklahoma City, Okla.

nent, to point the way to an adjustment that was more equitable than either extreme position would have been.

There are two other aspects of the customs case which will be of some future interest. Before the Permanent Court's decision was announced, there were plain indications that if the court ruled in favor of the legality of the customs protocol, France would nevertheless object on political grounds to the consummation of the union. If that had been done—and who will deny that it would have been attempted—France would have sought to revise the treaty settlements. The Permanent Court would have ruled that the treaties and the protocol of 1922 permitted the economic *Anschluss*. France would have then endeavored to prevent the economic *Anschluss* and in effect to amend the treaties. The French position has been that the treaty structure of Europe is sacrosanct. Should not the logical position now be that the treaty structure is sacrosanct unless France wishes to change it to her own advantage?

And what will France's position be when closer economic arrangements are discussed for the states bordering on the Danube? Could Austria enter into a customs union with Hungary without compromising her independence? The advisory opinion would seem to say no, but the juridical question would not arise since the French representative on the League Council would probably not object. Would he thereby sanction on political grounds an agreement which violated the protocol of 1922? When such questions are posed and answered, that logic of which the French occasionally boast may be subjected to slight strains.

□ WITHIN THE FORTNIGHT □

Plays to See

Brief Moment—Cort—W. 48 St.
Civic Light Opera Co.—Erlanger's—W. 44 St.
Counsellor-at-Law—Plymouth—W. 45 St.
Cynara—Morosco—45 St. W of B'way.
Distant Drums—Belasco—W. 44 St.
Electro—Selwyn—W. 42 St.
Hay Fever—Avon—W. 45 St.
Jewell Robbery—Booth—45 St. W. of B'way.
Mourning Becomes Electra—Guild—52 St. W. of B'way.
Of Thee I Sing—Music Box—W. 45 St.
Reunion in Vienna—Martin Beck—45 St. & 8 Ave.
Springtime for Henry—Bijou—45 St. W. of B'way.
The Animal Kingdom—Broadhurst—44 St. W. of B'way.
The Bride The Sun Shines On—Geo. M. Cohen—B'way. & 43 St.
The Devil Passes—Selwyn—W. 42 St.
The Good Fairy—Henry Miller's—124 W. 43 St.
The Left Bank—Little—44 St.
Whistling in the Dark—Ethel Barrymore—47 St. W. of B'way.

Debate

"Should Divorce in America Be Made Easier,"—Morris L. Ernst, and Rev. Wm. Sheafe Chase, D.D., Tuesday evening, February 9, 8:30 p.m., at Auditorium, 150 West 85th Street.

Opera Benefit

"La Juive," Metropolitan Opera House, February 22, at 2 p.m., American Ort Benefit, to aid the Jews of Eastern Europe.

See page ii for plays, films, debates, lectures, reunion and benefit.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED